

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
521	Ian	MacDougall	GB4	The sites proposed are in areas that flood. The proposals will add to existing 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
521	Ian	MacDougall	GB5	The sites proposed are in areas that flood. The proposals will add to existing 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
521	Ian	MacDougall	GB4	There is inadequate infrastructure to meet current needs, in terms of flood drainage, health facilities, roads and congestion. Development will exacerbate the situation.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0. In terms of health facilities, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
521	Ian	MacDougall	GB5	There is inadequate infrastructure to meet current needs, in terms of flood drainage, health facilities, roads and congestion. Development will exacerbate the situation.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0. In terms of health facilities, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
521	Ian	MacDougall	GB4	There is a significant amount of Green Belt in the Borough but proposal removal of sites has not be allocated equitably and sites for new building pushed out to the eastern edges of the Borough.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in the DPD are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
521	Ian	MacDougall	GB5	There is a significant amount of Green Belt in the Borough but proposal removal of sites has not be allocated equitably and sites for new building pushed out to the eastern edges of the Borough.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in the DPD are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
524	Gillian	Macdougall	GB4	Byfleet suffers from flooding and the development is in the floodplain of the Wey and Wey Navigation Canal, which will worsen 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 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
524	Gillian	Macdougall	GB5	Byfleet suffers from flooding and the development is in the floodplain of the Wey and Wey Navigation Canal, which will worsen 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 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
524	Gillian	Macdougall	GB4	The Plans show the Council's intention to dump [housing] on Byfleet. The majority of Green Belt land being released is in our village or West Byfleet, and the rest of the Borough's Green Belt seems to be escaping unscathed.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in the DPD 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>	
524	Gillian	Macdougall	GB5	The Plans show the Council's intention to dump [housing] on Byfleet. The majority of Green Belt land being released is in our village or West Byfleet, and the rest of the Borough's Green Belt seems to be escaping unscathed.	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 the DPD 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
524	Gillian	Macdougall	GB4	The infrastructure in the village is inadequate for current needs and would struggle to cope with the additional population. This included traffic and congestion on Parvis Road (A245), the drainage system and medical and health facilities.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0. With regard to health facilities, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
524	Gillian	Macdougall	GB5	The infrastructure in the village is inadequate for current needs and would struggle to cope with the additional population. This included traffic and congestion on Parvis Road (A245), the drainage system and medical and health facilities.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0. With regard to health facilities, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB8	Object to proposals in Mayford. The local infrastructure can not support an increase in population and the associated strain on the highways network. The roads are insufficient and dangerous to support the additional traffic. Roads are narrow, with poor visibility and no pavements. Three single lane railway bridges will be strained.	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, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB9	Object to proposals in Mayford. The local infrastructure can not support an increase in population and the associated strain on the highways network. The roads are insufficient and dangerous to support the additional traffic. Roads are narrow, with poor visibility and no pavements. Three single lane railway bridges will be strained.	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, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB10	Object to proposals in Mayford. The local infrastructure can not support an increase in population and the associated strain on the highways network. The roads are insufficient and dangerous to support the additional traffic. Roads are narrow, with poor visibility and no pavements. Three single lane railway bridges will be strained.	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, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB11	Object to proposals in Mayford. The local infrastructure can not support an increase in population and the associated strain on the highways network. The roads are insufficient and dangerous to support the additional traffic. Roads are narrow, with poor visibility and	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, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				no pavements. Three single lane railway bridges will be strained.		access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
326	Paul	Mace	GB7	Historically, planning inspectors have refused proposals for the area as it would reduce the openness of the GB. There has been no change	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
326	Paul	Mace	GB7	The Mayford area does not satisfy the criteria for where traveller sites should be located. Where if 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 has limited in its service and infrastructure	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. particularly paragraph 4.3 and 4.6-4.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB8	Development will increase surface water in the area and will increase the risk of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB9	Development will increase surface water in the area and will increase the risk of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB10	Development will increase surface water in the area and will increase the risk of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB11	Development will increase surface water in the area and will increase the risk of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB8	Mayford has limited services/facilities and can not support the proposed level of development	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>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council is working with the relevant public transport operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB9	Mayford has limited services/facilities and can not support the proposed level of development	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council is working with the relevant public transport operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	
326	Paul	Mace	GB10	Mayford has limited services/facilities and can not support the proposed level of development	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>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council is working with the relevant public transport operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB11	Mayford has limited services/facilities and can not support the proposed level of development	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>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council is working with the relevant public transport operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0	
326	Paul	Mace	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
326	Paul	Mace	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
326	Paul	Mace	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
326	Paul	Mace	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
326	Paul	Mace	GB8	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB9	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB10	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB11	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB8	Mayford has a strong historical character. There appears to be no consideration of the impact on character of Mayford.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB9	Mayford has a strong historical character. There appears to be no consideration of the impact on character of Mayford.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB10	Mayford has a strong historical character. There appears to be no consideration of the impact on character of Mayford.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB11	Mayford has a strong historical character. There appears to be no consideration of the impact on character of Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
326	Paul	Mace	GB7	Mayford already makes a significant contribution to the traveller community with several traveller sites in the vicinity. Instead of the site being extended, traveller sites should be spread throughout the borough	Traveller sites should be distributed throughout the borough not concentrated in one area	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
326	Paul	Mace	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	Exclude Prey Heath and Smarts Heath from consideration	<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
326	Paul	Mace	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	Exclude Prey Heath and Smarts Heath from consideration	<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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
326	Paul	Mace	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	Exclude Prey Heath and Smarts Heath from consideration	<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
326	Paul	Mace	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	Exclude Prey Heath and Smarts Heath from consideration	<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
618	J	Mace	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	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
618	J	Mace	GB8	Mayford does not have enough local facilities at the moment, let alone to support additional housing (i.e. shops/ medical facilities/ schools/ public transport).	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
						<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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
618	J	Mace	GB9	Mayford does not have enough local facilities at the moment, let alone to support additional housing (i.e. shops/ medical facilities/ schools/ public transport).	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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB10	Mayford does not have enough local facilities at the moment, let alone to support additional housing (i.e. shops/ medical facilities/ schools/ public transport).	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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
						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 best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
618	J	Mace	GB11	Mayford does not have enough local facilities at the moment, let alone to support additional housing (i.e. shops/ medical facilities/ schools/ public transport).	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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate healthcare provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society 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
618	J	Mace	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society 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
618	J	Mace	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society 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
618	J	Mace	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Happy for the Mayford Village Society 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
618	J	Mace	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
618	J	Mace	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
618	J	Mace	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
618	J	Mace	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
618	J	Mace	GB8	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB9	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB10	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB11	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB8	The Green Belt purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" is relevant to Mayford, which has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB9	The Green Belt purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" is relevant to Mayford, which has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	
618	J	Mace	GB10	The Green Belt purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" is relevant to Mayford, which has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB11	The Green Belt purpose "To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" is relevant to Mayford, which has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB8	Concerned about the wildlife on the proposed development sites and the surrounding area. Outlines birds and other wildlife seen from their garden, much of which would be killed or displaced if building on the Green Belt is allowed.	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
618	J	Mace	GB9	Concerned about the wildlife on the proposed development sites and the surrounding area. Outlines birds and other wildlife seen from their garden, much of which would be killed or displaced if building on the Green Belt is allowed.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
618	J	Mace	GB10	Concerned about the wildlife on the proposed development sites and the surrounding area. Outlines birds and other wildlife seen from their garden, much of which would be killed or displaced if building on the Green Belt is allowed.	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
618	J	Mace	GB11	Concerned about the wildlife on the proposed development sites and the surrounding area. Outlines birds and other wildlife seen from their garden, much of which would be killed or displaced if building on the Green Belt is allowed.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
618	J	Mace	GB9	Love living on Saunders Lane due to the quiet rural location. Feeding back thoughts on planning proposals which will impact Mayford.	None stated.	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
618	J	Mace	GB7	Love living on Saunders Lane due to the quiet rural location. Feeding back thoughts on planning proposals which will impact 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
618	J	Mace	GB8	Love living on Saunders Lane due to the quiet rural location. Feeding back thoughts on planning proposals which will impact Mayford.	None stated.	This representation is dealt with in its following Sections (this is its introduction).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB10	Love living on Saunders Lane due to the quiet rural location. Feeding back thoughts on planning proposals which will impact Mayford.	None stated.	This representation is dealt with in its following Sections (this is its introduction).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB11	Love living on Saunders Lane due to the quiet rural location. Feeding back thoughts on planning proposals which will impact Mayford.	None stated.	This representation is dealt with in its following Sections (this is its introduction).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB8	Objects to the proposals. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support such an increase in population. Then road are narrow, some single land and many without pavements. There are high volumes of traffic already at peak times, and additional traffic would worsen this and increase danger to road users and pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB9	Objects to the proposals. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support such an increase in population. Then road are narrow, some single land and many without pavements. There are high volumes of traffic already at peak times, and additional traffic would worsen this and increase danger to road users and pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB10	Objects to the proposals. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support such an increase in population. Then road are narrow, some single land and many without pavements. There are high volumes of traffic already at peak times, and additional traffic would worsen this and increase danger to road users and pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB11	Objects to the proposals. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support such an increase in population. Then road are narrow, some single land and many without pavements. There are high volumes of traffic already at peak times, and additional traffic would worsen this and increase danger to road users and pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB7	There are already several traveller sites in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford. Traveller sites should be spread throughout the Borough, not all within 3 miles of each other.	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
618	J	Mace	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Nothing has changed so questions why the application is being reconsidered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process. Therefore, circumstances are quite different.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
618	J	Mace	GB7	Understands that criteria for traveller sites dictates that priority should be given to urban area, or edge of urban area sites, that benefit from good access to jobs, shops, other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria, and only has a village shop and barbers, and does not have footpaths on Smarts Heath Road.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						better meet the day to day needs of local people.	
618	J	Mace	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.	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
618	J	Mace	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.	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
618	J	Mace	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.	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
618	J	Mace	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.	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
621	N	Mace	GB8	Having dealt with these sort of infrastructure issues before, we know the answer lies with different departments, and that any issues will be dealt with post development. This is not appropriate as infrastructure in the area already no longer copes. There is already unacceptable traffic and congestion.	None stated.	Comment noted and it is accepted that while the solutions may be delivered by other departments or organisations, good planning should help to ensure that there is adequate local infrastructure to support development. More detail, and the mechanisms for doing this are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11) and are also set out in a more strategic sense in the Council's Core Strategy (Policy CS16) and Community Infrastructure Levy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB9	Having dealt with these sort of infrastructure issues before, we know the answer lies with different departments, and that any issues will be dealt with post development. This is not appropriate as infrastructure in the area already no longer copes. There is already unacceptable traffic and congestion.	None stated.	Comment noted and it is accepted that while the solutions may be delivered by other departments or organisations, good planning should help to ensure that there is adequate local infrastructure to support development. More detail, and the mechanisms for doing this are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11) and are also set out in a more strategic sense in the Council's Core Strategy (Policy CS16) and Community Infrastructure Levy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB10	Having dealt with these sort of infrastructure issues before, we know the answer lies with different departments, and that any issues will be dealt with post development. This is not appropriate as infrastructure in the area already no longer copes. There is already unacceptable traffic and congestion.	None stated.	Comment noted and it is accepted that while the solutions may be delivered by other departments or organisations, good planning should help to ensure that there is adequate local infrastructure to support development. More detail, and the mechanisms for doing this are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11) and are also set out in a more strategic sense in the Council's Core Strategy (Policy CS16) and Community Infrastructure Levy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB11	Having dealt with these sort of infrastructure issues before, we know the answer lies with different departments, and that any issues will be dealt with post development. This is not appropriate as infrastructure in the area already no longer copes. There is already unacceptable traffic and congestion.	None stated.	Comment noted and it is accepted that while the solutions may be delivered by other departments or organisations, good planning should help to ensure that there is adequate local infrastructure to support development. More detail, and the mechanisms for doing this are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11) and are also set out in a more strategic sense in the Council's Core Strategy (Policy CS16) and Community Infrastructure Levy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB14	Having dealt with these sort of infrastructure issues before, we know the answer lies with different departments, and that any issues will be dealt with post development. This is not appropriate as infrastructure in the area already no longer copes. There is already unacceptable traffic and congestion.	None stated.	Comment noted and it is accepted that while the solutions may be delivered by other departments or organisations, good planning should help to ensure that there is adequate local infrastructure to support development. More detail, and the mechanisms for doing this are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraph 3.6 and 3.11) and are also set out in a more strategic sense in the Council's Core Strategy (Policy CS16) and Community Infrastructure Levy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>for 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>	
621	N	Mace	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for intended occupiers, including space for related business activities. This is a residential road with two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Even if the site were appropriate, 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
621	N	Mace	GB7	It is significant that successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Why is it now acceptable?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process. Therefore, circumstances are quite different.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB7	Urban sites should be considered before any further incursion into the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on already overloaded local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements, or single lane railway bridges) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
621	N	Mace	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on already overloaded local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements, or single lane railway bridges) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
621	N	Mace	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on already overloaded local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements, or single lane railway bridges) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
621	N	Mace	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on already overloaded local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements, or single lane railway bridges) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
621	N	Mace	GB14	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on already overloaded local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some without pavements, or single lane	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				railway bridges) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road.		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.	
621	N	Mace	GB8	In addition to significant infrastructure issues, there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless 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
621	N	Mace	GB9	In addition to significant infrastructure issues, there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless 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
621	N	Mace	GB10	In addition to significant infrastructure issues, there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
621	N	Mace	GB7	Objects to the proposal. Currently, Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdeshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution 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
621	N	Mace	GB8	Please reconsider the plans. The area is already being overdeveloped, with too many houses squeezed in. This brings with it 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, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB9	Please reconsider the plans. The area is already being overdeveloped, with too many houses squeezed in. This brings with it 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, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB10	Please reconsider the plans. The area is already being overdeveloped, with too many houses squeezed in. This brings with it 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, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB11	Please reconsider the plans. The area is already being overdeveloped, with too many houses squeezed in. This brings with it 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, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB14	Please reconsider the plans. The area is already being overdeveloped, with too many houses squeezed in. This brings with it 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, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
621	N	Mace	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The various proposals will remove significant amounts of Green Belt, which will merge Mayford and Woking, and mean Mayford will no longer be its own entity. It is surely only a matter of time before Woking and Guildford become one, and we are sadly looking at the creation of a Wokeford or a Guilding! The defeats the concept and purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</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
621	N	Mace	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The various proposals will remove significant amounts of Green Belt, which will merge Mayford and Woking, and mean Mayford will no longer be its own entity. It is surely only a matter of time before Woking and Guildford become one, and we are sadly looking at the creation of a Wokeford or a Guilding! The defeats the concept and purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</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
621	N	Mace	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The various proposals will remove significant amounts of Green Belt, which will merge Mayford and Woking, and mean Mayford will no longer be its own entity. It is surely only a matter of time before Woking and Guildford become one, and we are sadly looking at the creation of a Wokeford or a Guilding! The defeats the concept and purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
621	N	Mace	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The various proposals will remove significant amounts of Green Belt, which will merge Mayford and Woking, and mean Mayford will no longer be its own entity. It is surely only a matter of time before Woking and Guildford become one, and we are sadly looking at the creation of a Wokeford or a Guilding! The defeats the concept and purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</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
621	N	Mace	GB14	Objects to the proposal. The various proposals will remove significant amounts of Green Belt, which will merge Mayford and Woking, and mean Mayford will no longer be its own entity. It is surely only a matter of time before Woking and Guildford become one, and we are sadly looking at the creation of a Wokeford or a Guilding! The defeats the concept and purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</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
621	N	Mace	GB8	The proposals will have a devastating impact on Mayford, and will wipe Mayford out as a village, to become Woking. We are members of Mayford Village Society and happy for them to represent our views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>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
621	N	Mace	GB9	The proposals will have a devastating impact on Mayford, and will wipe Mayford out as a village, to become Woking. We are members of Mayford Village Society and happy for them to represent our views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>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
621	N	Mace	GB10	The proposals will have a devastating impact on Mayford, and will wipe Mayford out as a village, to become Woking. We are members of Mayford Village Society and happy for them to represent our views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>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
621	N	Mace	GB11	The proposals will have a devastating impact on Mayford, and will wipe Mayford out as a village, to become Woking. We are members of Mayford Village Society and happy for them to represent our views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>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
621	N	Mace	GB14	The proposals will have a devastating impact on Mayford, and will wipe Mayford out as a village, to become Woking. We are members of Mayford Village Society and happy for them to represent our views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Development would increase water run off and increase the risk of flooding. The area has a history of flooding and there is no reference as to what sustainable drainage will be required on the site.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB9	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The transport assessment takes into account consented and under construction development schemes within the Borough and wider area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the Economic Strategy of the Council and contains specific policies to facilitate the delivery of this strategy. The Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites that will generate a wide range of employment opportunities across the Borough. These are all set out in the Urban Area Section of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB10	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The transport assessment takes into account consented and under construction development schemes within the Borough and wider 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
						The Core Strategy sets out the Economic Strategy of the Council and contains specific policies to facilitate the delivery of this strategy. The Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites that will generate a wide range of employment opportunities across the Borough. These are all set out in the Urban Area Section of the DPD.	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB11	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The transport assessment takes into account consented and under construction development schemes within the Borough and wider area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the Economic Strategy of the Council and contains specific policies to facilitate the delivery of this strategy. The Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites that will generate a wide range of employment opportunities across the Borough. These are all set out in the Urban Area Section of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Egley Road floods in heavy rain and there is no mention of how this will be mitigated or the effects of extra traffic if this occurs.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the</p>	No further modification is 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>County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p> <p>The suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB9	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must</p>	No further modification is 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>contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p> <p>The suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB10	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning</p>	No further modification is 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>application stage.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p> <p>The suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB11	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p>	No further modification is 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 suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Flood lighting will destroy the rural character of Mayford and be visible across a huge part of the village. It will have an adverse affect on the quality of life for residents.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area. It is noted that floodlighting could have a significant impact on the local landscape however in this instance the impact is not considered to be significant enough to prevent the development from being granted planning permission. Generally development will 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>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB11	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB9	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB10	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Mayford is in the Green Belt and special circumstances should be proven for development. Whilst I understand the need for a new school, I do not believe it is the only area it could have been proposed but the easiest one.	None stated.	As set out in the planning application for this scheme and the Planning Committee Report, part of the case for Very Special Circumstances highlighted that there were no suitable alternative sites available in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	General	Strongly object to proposals in Mayford and should be read in conjunction with objections regarding the proposed Egley Road School and Leisure Centre. I endorse the representations made by the Mayford Village Society.	None stated.	<p>Objection to the proposed school and leisure centre noted.</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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB7	Disproportionate for Mayford to provide 12 out of the required 19 pitches. Mayford has a number of Traveller sites in the local area whilst the north of the borough have none. There is no previous unmet need so Mayford will be	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraphs 4.4, 4.8 and 4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				providing 12 additional pitches out of a currently unmet need of 20. Any business related activities on the site would be inappropriate in the Green Belt.			
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a “land bank” and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB9	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a “land bank” and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB10	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a “land bank” and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB11	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a “land bank” and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses will put a large strain on the existing services.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB9	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses will put a large strain on the existing services.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB10	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses will put a large strain on the existing services.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB11	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses will put a large strain on the existing services.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Litter will increase and there is no mention as to how It will be mitigated.	9. School to be responsible and accountable for providing litter bins, their emptying, and clear-up patrols. The residents should neither have to tolerate the litter nor clean it up.  10. School to provide hotline for dealing with antisocial or abusive behaviour including, but not limited to, littering, parental parking in residential streets, offensive language to residents.	Although litter and waste are planning considerations, they should be considered at the Development Management stage. Nevertheless the Council has a robust policy framework regarding the storage and collection of waste and recyclable materials including Core Strategy Policy CS21.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Mayford already has the Freemantles School built under special circumstances and has therefore done its bit in this respect.	None stated.	The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	WBC do not run the buses and there are no plans for additional buses	3. Bus services to be laid on from the most popular catchment areas (e.g. Westfield/Moor Lane, South Woking).	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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 provision for additional bus services is likely to have been considered as part of the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for the proposed school and leisure centre and more information can be found within the approved planning application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	The current cycle path north of Almond Avenue is incomplete.	None stated.	As stated in the key requirements for the site, at the Development Management stage, a Transport Assessment will be required to demonstrate the existing network issues and set out the proposed improvements/mitigation measures. The key requirements state that issues to be addressed will include the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities and linkages.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB7	The proposal is adjacent to an SSSI and would have a negative visual impact. Applications have been refused previously on the site for being inappropriate.	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.  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. 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.  This representation has also been 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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Light pollution will increase from the floodlights which will have a negative impact on residents and wildlife.	13. No events requiring a PA system on Sundays, or before 1000 or after 1700h.No floodlights after 1930.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	The proposed hours of operation will result in disruption everyday	If, contrary to this objection, the Leisure Centre is permitted, then the following additional conditions would, I contend, be required: 12. Opening hours to be 0800-2000h Mon-Fri and 0800-1800 Sat, Sun and	The proposed leisure centre at site GB8 is not intended to be open continuously. As part of the planning permission granted for the site, there are strict conditions on opening/operational hours, see condition 55.  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. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					BH. 15. No deliveries before 0800 or after 1700. 20 Maximum seating capacity of stadium to be 200.		
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	The area is subject to flooding and development will increase surface water runoff, increase risk to neighbouring properties. There is no mention of mitigation measures.	6. Drainage for groundwater and storage of same to be built as part of the development.  21. Detailed and effective flood mitigation plans to be in place for storage and disposal of groundwater.	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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Given the size of the proposal and the volume of traffic generated, a 'visual break' will not sustain the illusion of this being in the Green Belt or countryside, or being a separate settlement from Woking. The comments of 'open space' and 'playing fields' are misleading as they are artificial and also contain a massive sports arena. This would not preserve the character of the area or views across it.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</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> <p>The key requirements for the site state that through suitable design solutions, the impact of the proposal on landscape and local character can be minimised. This includes the retention of trees and tree belts, green corridors, the provision of open space and appropriate landscaping.</p> <p>The representation regarding traffic has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The representation on views and character 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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.</p> <p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB9	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.</p> <p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB10	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.</p> <p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB11	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.</p> <p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	No special circumstances for the leisure centre and the existing one is close by in Kingfield. Understand the aspiration for everyone to be within 800m of a leisure centre but instead of having two so close to each other, a better solution would be to have one in the north of the borough.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>The Council is currently undertaking a Playing Pitch Strategy to identify existing sport facilities and deficiencies in the Borough. This review will inform the future updates of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the CIL Regulation 123 List.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	The proposed cycle route would serve no purpose as it would not be connected to a network.	2. Full-size dedicated	The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS18, states that the Council is committed to developing a well integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects people to jobs, services and community facilities and minimises impacts on	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
					cycle paths to be built to east and west of Egley Road and along Westfield Road to facilitate travel to school. NOT dual use paths (as these will be needed in their entirety for pedestrians).	biodiversity. The proposed allocation of this site seeks to implement this policy by creating a cycle network in and around Mayford. This will reduce the need to travel by car.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to improve the existing situation.	of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Noise pollution from the school and leisure centre will have a negative impact on residents, in addition to the noise from traffic.	5. School facilities to be closed by 1800h. School not to be hired out for the holidays. No deliveries to the school before 0800 or after 1800h.  17. No commercial hire e.g. for concerts, auctions, sales, dinners, religious gatherings. 18. No alcohol license, and no events requiring an alcohol licence e.g. club AGMs. 19. No activities in athletics stadium other than athletics e.g. no open-air concerts/shows/gatherings.	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. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Odours will emit from the school and leisure centre that will have a negative impact on adjacent properties and the wider village.	7. No events at the school requiring alcohol licensing.  8. Catering Ventilation to be fitted with	The Council has specific policies, such as CS21, that deal with developments that create significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from releases such as odours. As part of the planning permission granted for the proposed school and leisure centre on this site, this would have been taken into account by the case officer and Planning Committee and any relevant conditions would have been applied if deemed to be suitable.	No further modification is 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>suitable odour-eliminating devices to ensure that odours are not spread to the community.</p> <p>16. No catering vans to be allowed onsite e.g. ice creams/burger s.</p>		
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB7	Development would require more hardstanding and increase flood risk within a flood prone area. This could increase flood risk to other properties. The DPD is vague about mitigation measures, monitoring and enforcement.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and Section 5.0, paragraph 5.4-5.6	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Traffic on Egley Road is a problem and any traffic survey carried out during half term would be inaccurate. Even with just the school, traffic volumes will greatly increase. Pupils will not walk or cycle.	<p>1. Proper term-time assessment of existing traffic.</p> <p>4. School to police drop-off zones and ensure that the surrounding roads are not used as ancillary drop-off/waiting zones by parents. Strict policy for parents about not using other roads for this, which they must be directed to adhere to.</p> <p>14. Bus service to be laid on from Sheerwater (since it is alleged that this track would be replacing the one demolished by the council in that area).</p> <p>22. Parking restrictions to be in place</p>	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>It should be noted that traffic surveys consider traffic volume, flow and distribution when traffic is flowing in the usual way. Therefore any traffic surveys carried out during school holidays are unlikely to reflect the true traffic situation. The County Highways Authority is unlikely to carry out such a survey during half term as suggested by the representation.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed educational facility on the road network has been consider by the CHA and Local Planning Authority and is set out within the Officers Report to the Planning Committee, which is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS18, states that the Council is committed to developing a well integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects people to jobs, services and community facilities and minimises impacts on biodiversity. The proposed allocation of this site seeks to implement this policy by creating a cycle network in and around Mayford. This will reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The proposed modifications or conditions are noted by the Council. The proposed school has recently been granted planning permission and the full set of conditions attached to 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
					e.g. residents' parking only in side-streets to avoid the users parking there in times of high demand.	permission can be found online. The proposed modification for Sheerwater will be considered at the Development Management stage for the Sheerwater application.	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	Traffic will be a huge problem and the DPD is vague about this. It states that development will access the A320 but it is hard to believe that cycle paths to Mayford would assist. There is nothing in Mayford to attract pupils and if a parental drop off zone is proposed it will be strongly resisted. The road to Westfield is busy and narrow and a cycle route would be impossible. This will result in pupils travelling by car and will create further congestion.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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. The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS18, states that the Council is committed to developing a well integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects people to jobs, services and community facilities and minimises impacts on biodiversity. The proposed allocation of this site seeks to implement this policy by creating a cycle network in and around Mayford. This will reduce the need to travel by car. The Council is not proposing a drop off area in Mayford Village and neither is the application for the school which was granted planning permission recently. The Council has also not stated that a cycle link to Moor Lane is a key requirement for the site. The allocation states that pedestrian and cycle facilities and linkages will be required to Barnsbury Primary School and beyond to services in Westfield.</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
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB8	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</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.</p>	No further modification is 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>Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the 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 existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB9	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The 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.</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB10	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the 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 existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB11	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The 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.</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
814	Alexandra	MacInnes	GB7	If the landowner is willing to extend the site, this should not be the overriding reason for granting planning permission. There is no mention that the Travellers on the site have to have any connection with the area. This could result in the area becoming a magnet for Travellers from elsewhere, resulting in more local unmet need.	GB7- if there is to be a grant of additional pitches this should be limited to an extra 2 (total 5) and no permission for any business activities.	<p>The representation regarding the need for Traveller accommodation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. It should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD does not grant planning permission.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to provide enough Traveller pitches in the Borough to meet the need based on the evidence of the Travellers Accommodation Assessment (TAA). The Council has no control on whether the pitches are specifically allocated for local Travellers in the same way it can not allocate private housing to local people.</p> <p>The Council believes that the need for Traveller accommodation is set out in Section 4.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Therefore the Council does not believe that limiting the number of pitches at the site to 5 in total will meet the accommodation need of the Borough and could require the Council to identify more land in the Green Belt. The proposed modification regarding business activities has been addressed in Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12 in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Development would increase water run off and increase the risk of flooding. The area has a history of flooding and there is no reference as to what sustainable drainage will be	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				required on the site.			
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The transport assessment takes into account consented and under construction development schemes within the Borough and wider area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the Economic Strategy of the Council and contains specific policies to facilitate the delivery of this strategy. The Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites that will generate a wide range of employment opportunities across the Borough. These are all set out in the Urban Area Section of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB9	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The transport assessment takes into account consented and under construction development schemes within the Borough and wider area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the Economic Strategy of the Council and contains specific policies to facilitate the delivery of this strategy. The Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites that will generate a wide range of employment opportunities across the Borough. These are all set out in the Urban Area Section of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB10	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic 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</p>	No further modification is 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>traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The transport assessment takes into account consented and under construction development schemes within the Borough and wider area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the Economic Strategy of the Council and contains specific policies to facilitate the delivery of this strategy. The Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites that will generate a wide range of employment opportunities across the Borough. These are all set out in the Urban Area Section of the DPD.</p>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB11	All infrastructure assessments have been calculated with a 2015 baseline. The delay in development combined with developments taking place within the wider region will result in commuters travelling to London by car or train rather than local employment.	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 when the sites come forward for development post 2027. To clarify, it is at this stage in the development management process that a detailed and up to date Transport Assessment will be carried out.</p> <p>Specific strategic requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The transport assessment takes into account consented and under construction development schemes within the Borough and wider area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the Economic Strategy of the Council and contains specific policies to facilitate the delivery of this strategy. The Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites that will generate a wide range of employment opportunities across the Borough. These are all set out in the Urban Area Section of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Egley Road floods in heavy rain and there is no mention of how this will be mitigated or the effects of extra traffic if this occurs.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the</p>	No further modification is 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>Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p> <p>The suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB9	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to</p>	No further modification is 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>address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p> <p>The suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB10	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p> <p>The suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB11	Mayford has a village feel. The proposals will double the size of the village and turn it into a suburb of Woking. The Leisure Centre plan includes more shops, etc. The open space in the village is heathland and a natural habitat. The proposed SANGs would not replace this or mitigate the loss of peace and quiet. The increased traffic would create noise and air pollution. The area would never 'sleep' due to the increase in people and activity. Mayford would become a dormitory for commuters to London and would lose it's current mixed character or ages and occupations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation of Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not propose to allocate any sites for development on Heathlands. The Council agrees that Heathlands should be protected and enhanced for biodiversity where possible. The Council has consulted with Natural England regarding the draft DPD and no concern has been raised regarding the impact of development on protected Heathlands.</p> <p>The proposed SANGs are to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas. More information regarding the purpose of SANGs can be found in the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is 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 Development Management Policies DPD contains a policy dealing with air pollution and how the impact of air pollution should be mitigated.</p> <p>The suggested deliveries at the proposed school and leisure centre would be controlled by planning condition to protect adjacent residential properties from noise pollution.</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>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Flood lighting will destroy the rural character of Mayford and be visible across a huge part of the village. It will have an adverse affect on the quality of life for residents.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area. It is noted that floodlighting could have a significant impact on the local landscape however in this instance the impact is not considered to be significant enough to prevent the development from being granted planning permission. Generally development will 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>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB9	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB10	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB11	Flooding is a major concern in Mayford as it can come from the Hoe Stream or groundwater. Houses will be built on rising land but will disperse flooding to other areas and properties. No mitigation measures in place. The flood plain at Moor Lane is already being built on and will make matters worse in Mayford. Egley Road already floods easily.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Mayford is in the Green Belt and special circumstances should be proven for development. Whilst I understand the need for a new school, I do not believe it is the only area it could have been proposed but the easiest one.	None stated.	As set out in the planning application for this scheme and the Planning Committee Report, part of the case for Very Special Circumstances highlighted that there were no suitable alternative sites available in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	General	Strongly object to proposals in Mayford and should be read in conjunction with objections regarding the proposed Egley Road School and Leisure Centre. I endorse the representations made by the Mayford Village Society.	None stated.	<p>Objection to the proposed school and leisure centre noted.</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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB7	Disproportionate for Mayford to provide 12 out of the required 19 pitches. Mayford has a number of Traveller sites in the local area whilst the north of the borough have none. There is no previous unmet need so Mayford will be providing 12 additional pitches out of a currently unmet need of 20. Any business related activities on the site would be inappropriate in the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraphs 4.4, 4.8 and 4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a "land bank" and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB9	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a "land bank" and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB10	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a "land bank" and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB11	It is irrelevant that the developer holds this in a "land bank" and therefore it is easily available. The adverse effect of this development on the surrounding area outweigh the administrative ease this presents.	Develop the north of the borough or spread the development so there's a few houses in every parish not 619 in one Green Belt area.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The site selection process took into account a wide range of evidence documents including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). 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.</p> <p>As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the Council is proposing to release Green Belt land in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Mayford, Pyrford and Brookwood. The majority of these sites are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses	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
				will put a large strain on the existing services.		health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB9	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses will put a large strain on the existing services.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB10	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses will put a large strain on the existing services.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB11	There are no doctors within close distance to the area and not easily accessible by public transport. There is no provision for a doctors surgery in the DPD and extra houses will put a large strain on the existing services.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Litter will increase and there is no mention as to how It will be mitigated.	9. School to be responsible and accountable for providing litter bins, their emptying, and clear-up patrols. The residents should neither have to tolerate the litter nor clean it up.  10. School to provide hotline for dealing with antisocial or abusive behaviour including, but not limited to, littering, parental parking in residential streets, offensive language to residents.	Although litter and waste are planning considerations, they should be considered at the Development Management stage. Nevertheless the Council has a robust policy framework regarding the storage and collection of waste and recyclable materials including Core Strategy Policy CS21.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Mayford already has the Freemantles School built under special circumstances and has therefore done its bit in this respect.	None stated.	The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						successfully made in this instance.	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	WBC do not run the buses and there are no plans for additional buses	3. Bus services to be laid on from the most popular catchment areas (e.g. Westfield/Moor Lane, South Woking).	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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 provision for additional bus services is likely to have been considered as part of the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for the proposed school and leisure centre and more information can be found within the approved planning application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	The current cycle path north of Almond Avenue is incomplete.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB7	The proposal is adjacent to an SSSI and would have a negative visual impact. Applications have been refused previously on the site for being inappropriate.	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.  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.  The representation regarding the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt as per the planning history of the site has been 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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Light pollution will increase from the floodlights which will have a negative impact on residents and wildlife.	13. No events requiring a PA system on Sundays, or before 1000 or after 1700h.No floodlights after 1930.	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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	The proposed hours of operation will result in disruption everyday	If, contrary to this objection, the Leisure Centre is permitted, then the following additional conditions would, I contend, be required: 12. Opening hours to be	The proposed leisure centre at site GB8 is not intended to be open continuously. As part of the planning permission granted for the site, there are strict conditions on opening/operational hours, see condition 55.  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. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					0800-2000h Mon-Fri and 0800-1800 Sat, Sun and BH. 15. No deliveries before 0800 or after 1700. 20 Maximum seating capacity of stadium to be 200.		
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	The area is subject to flooding and development will increase surface water runoff, increase risk to neighbouring properties. There is no mention of mitigation measures.	6. Drainage for groundwater and storage of same to be built as part of the development.  21. Detailed and effective flood mitigation plans to be in place for storage and disposal of groundwater.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.  The proposed groundwater and flood mitigation measures will be determined on a case by case basis at the Development Management stage. This has been considered on this site for the proposed school and leisure centre and more information can be found within the approved planning application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Given the size of the proposal and the volume of traffic generated, a 'visual break' will not sustain the illusion of this being in the Green Belt or countryside, or being a separate settlement from Woking. The comments of 'open space' and 'playing fields' are misleading as they are artificial and also contain a massive sports arena. This would not preserve the character of the area or views across it.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.  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.  The key requirements for the site state that through suitable design solutions, the impact of the proposal on landscape and local character can be minimised. This includes the retention of trees and tree belts, green corridors, the provision of open space and appropriate landscaping.  The representation regarding traffic has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular 3.1 to 3.6.  The representation on views and character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking.	None stated.	The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.</p>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB9	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking and work elsewhere. The problem of local people not being able to afford housing locally is not solved by these plans. The government's decision to allow Right to Buy will also not help local people obtain local properties.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.</p> <p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB10	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking and work elsewhere. The problem of local people not being able to afford housing locally is not solved by these plans. The government's decision to allow Right to Buy will also not help local people obtain local properties.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.</p> <p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB11	All of the proposed 619 homes planned for Mayford are in the Green Belt. This would double the existing number of homes. WBC state there is a need for housing but the demand is from people who want to live in Woking and work elsewhere. The problem of local people not being able to afford housing locally is not solved by these plans. The government's decision to allow Right to Buy will also not help local people obtain local properties.	None stated.	<p>The Council note that a significant number of dwellings are proposed around Mayford. It should be noted however that the sites in Mayford form only part of the Site Allocations DPD, which also includes Green Belt sites in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Brookwood and Pyrford, in addition to over 50 sites in the existing urban area. The sites identified in Mayford are Safeguarded sites, which are proposed to come forward for development post 2027. Through the key requirements set out in the DPD as well as the other policies of the Core Strategy, the Council believes that the character of Mayford Village will continued to be preserved.</p> <p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need. Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper clearly sets out the housing need in the Borough, including the need for affordable housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	No special circumstances for the leisure centre and the existing one is close by in Kingfield. Understand the aspiration for everyone to be within 800m of a leisure centre but instead of having two so close to each other, a better solution would be to have one in the north of the borough.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>The Council is currently undertaking a Playing Pitch Strategy to identify existing sport facilities and deficiencies in the Borough. This review will inform the future updates of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the CIL Regulation 123 List.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	The proposed cycle route would serve no purpose as it would not be connected to a network.	2. Full-size dedicated cycle paths to be built to east and west of Egley Road and along Westfield Road to facilitate travel to school. NOT dual use paths (as these will be needed in their entirety for pedestrians).	<p>The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS18, states that the Council is committed to developing a well integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects people to jobs, services and community facilities and minimises impacts on biodiversity. The proposed allocation of this site seeks to implement this policy by creating a cycle network in and around Mayford. This will reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to improve the existing situation.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Noise pollution from the school and leisure centre will have a negative impact on residents, in addition to the noise from traffic.	<p>5. School facilities to be closed by 1800h. School not to be hired out for the holidays. No deliveries to the school before 0800 or after 1800h.</p> <p>17. No commercial hire e.g. for concerts, auctions, sales, dinners, religious gatherings.</p> <p>18. No alcohol license, and no events requiring an alcohol licence e.g. club AGMs.</p> <p>19. No activities in athletics stadium other than athletics e.g. no open-air concerts/show s/gatherings.</p>	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Odours will emit from the school and leisure centre that will have a negative impact on adjacent properties and the wider village.	<p>7. No events at the school requiring alcohol licensing.</p> <p>8. Catering</p>	The Council has specific policies, such as CS21, that deal with developments that create significant harm to the environment and general amenity resulting from releases such as odours. As part of the planning permission granted for the proposed school and leisure centre on this site, this would have been taken into account by the case officer and Planning Committee and any relevant conditions would have been applied if deemed to be suitable.	No further modification is 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>Ventilation to be fitted with suitable odour-eliminating devices to ensure that odours are not spread to the community.</p> <p>16. No catering vans to be allowed onsite e.g. ice creams/burger s.</p>		
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB7	Development would require more hardstanding and increase flood risk within a flood prone area. This could increase flood risk to other properties. The DPD is vague about mitigation measures, monitoring and enforcement.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and Section 5.0, paragraph 5.4-5.6	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Traffic on Egley Road is a problem and any traffic survey carried out during half term would be inaccurate. Even with just the school, traffic volumes will greatly increase. Pupils will not walk or cycle.	<p>1. Proper term-time assessment of existing traffic.</p> <p>4. School to police drop-off zones and ensure that the surrounding roads are not used as ancillary drop-off/waiting zones by parents. Strict policy for parents about not using other roads for this, which they must be directed to adhere to.</p> <p>14. Bus service to be laid on from Sheerwater (since it is alleged that this track would be replacing the one demolished by the council in that area).</p> <p>22. Parking</p>	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>It should be noted that traffic surveys consider traffic volume, flow and distribution when traffic is flowing in the usual way. Therefore any traffic surveys carried out during school holidays are unlikely to reflect the true traffic situation. The County Highways Authority is unlikely to carry out such a survey during half term as suggested by the representation.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed educational facility on the road network has been consider by the CHA and Local Planning Authority and is set out within the Officers Report to the Planning Committee, which is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS18, states that the Council is committed to developing a well integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects people to jobs, services and community facilities and minimises impacts on biodiversity. The proposed allocation of this site seeks to implement this policy by creating a cycle network in and around Mayford. This will 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
					restrictions to be in place e.g. residents' parking only in side-streets to avoid the users parking there in times of high demand.	The proposed modifications or conditions are noted by the Council. The proposed school has recently been granted planning permission and the full set of conditions attached to the permission can be found online. The proposed modification for Sheerwater will be considered at the Development Management stage for the Sheerwater application.	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	Traffic will be a huge problem and the DPD is vague about this. It states that development will access the A320 but it is hard to believe that cycle paths to Mayford would assist. There is nothing in Mayford to attract pupils and if a parental drop off zone is proposed it will be strongly resisted. The road to Westfield is busy and narrow and a cycle route would be impossible. This will result in pupils travelling by car and will create further congestion.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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. The Core Strategy, in particular Policy CS18, states that the Council is committed to developing a well integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects people to jobs, services and community facilities and minimises impacts on biodiversity. The proposed allocation of this site seeks to implement this policy by creating a cycle network in and around Mayford. This will reduce the need to travel by car. The Council is not proposing a drop off area in Mayford Village and neither is the application for the school which was granted planning permission recently. The Council has also not stated that a cycle link to Moor Lane is a key requirement for the site. The allocation states that pedestrian and cycle facilities and linkages will be required to Barnsbury Primary School and beyond to services in Westfield.</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
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB8	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the 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 existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB9	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The 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.</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB10	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</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,</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the 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 existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB11	<p>The only recent traffic survey took place during half term and therefore not accurate. By increasing connectivity to Worplesdon Station, the houses will be filled with commuters. There is standing room only on the trains and no mention on any consultation with Network Rail and how this will be managed.</p> <p>The DPD is vague about how vehicular traffic will be managed, including dealing with pinch points on the network. WBC also has no control over the buses and these are currently not a reasonable alternative to private vehicle.</p>	None stated.	<p>In order to carry out a comprehensive transport assessment, it is essential that it is taken during the times of the year when traffic flow and congestion accurately reflects the day to day traffic situation. This usually includes during school holidays and in the weeks prior to and after Christmas. Therefore it is incorrect that traffic surveys have been carried out by the County Highways Authority during half term.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 clearly sets out that the Council will promote sustainable methods of transport in order to protect the environment and improve quality of life, in line with the NPPF. By setting out within the DPD that cycle paths will be required as part of any proposed development, it will result in the creation of or improvement to the cycle network in the Borough and local area. It is key to the sustainability aspirations of the Core Strategy that sustainable methods of travel are promoted and 'built-in' to developments as they come forward.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The 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.</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
816	Angus	MacInnes	GB7	If the landowner is willing to extend the site, this should not be the overriding reason for granting planning permission. There is no mention that the Travellers on the site have to have any connection with the area. This could result in the area becoming a magnet for Travellers from elsewhere, resulting in more local unmet need.	GB7- if there is to be a grant of additional pitches this should be limited to an extra 2 (total 5) and no permission for any business activities.	<p>The representation regarding the need for Traveller accommodation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. It should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD does not grant planning permission.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to provide enough Traveller pitches in the Borough to meet the need based on the evidence of the Travellers Accommodation Assessment (TAA). The Council has no control on whether the pitches are specifically allocated for local Travellers in the same way it can not allocate private housing to local people.</p> <p>The Council believes that the need for Traveller accommodation is set out in Section 4.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Therefore the Council does not believe that limiting the number of pitches at the site to 5 in total will meet the accommodation need of the Borough and could require the Council to identify more land in the Green Belt. The proposed modification regarding business activities has been addressed in Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12 in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
346	G	Mackay	GB14	Object to proposals in Hook Heath. The road infrastructure is insufficient, for example there are two single lane railway bridges 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.</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 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
346	G	Mackay	GB10	Object to proposals in Hook Heath. The road infrastructure is insufficient, for example there are two single lane railway bridges in the area	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
346	G	Mackay	GB11	Object to proposals in Hook Heath. The road infrastructure is insufficient, for example there are two single lane railway bridges in the area	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
346	G	Mackay	GB10	The GB provides fresh air and green space	None stated.	The Green Belt serves five main purposes and this is set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. Nevertheless, as set out in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper it is necessary for the Council to identify areas of GB land to help meet the Council's housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
346	G	Mackay	GB11	The GB provides fresh air and green space	None stated.	The Green Belt serves five main purposes and this is set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. Nevertheless, as set out in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper it is necessary for the Council to identify areas of GB land to help meet the Council's housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
346	G	Mackay	GB14	The GB provides fresh air and green space	None stated.	The Green Belt serves five main purposes and this is set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. Nevertheless, as set out in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper it is necessary for the Council to identify areas of GB land to help meet the Council's housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
346	G	Mackay	GB10	Concerned that all open green space will be lost in the end. Suggests the Guildford accommodates most of the growth	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
346	G	Mackay	GB11	Concerned that all open green space will be lost in the end. Suggests the Guildford accommodates most of the growth	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 15.0 and 24.0. It should be emphasised that we can not simply place all housing development elsewhere within other boroughs. This is not reasonable suggestion. There is a substantial evidence base behind the housing numbers established for the Borough and the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4964 dwellings by 2027. Therefore the Council is expected and committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
346	G	Mackay	GB14	Concerned that all open green space will be lost in the end. Suggests the Guildford accommodates most of the growth	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 15.0 and 24.0. It should be emphasised that we can not simply place all housing development elsewhere within other boroughs. This is not reasonable suggestion. There is a substantial evidence base behind the housing numbers established for the Borough and the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4964 dwellings by 2027. Therefore the Council is expected and committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
503	Christiane	Mackie	GB12	Raises concern about the traffic impacts on roads caused by additional housing (1165 units) proposed around Pyrford and West Byfleet. Particularly due to the restricted number of bridges crossing the M25 and A3, and with traffic already very bad on Old Woking Road and Oakcroft Road. These	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				impacts exclude those from proposals in Byfleet and Ripley, and will create an enormous burden on already inadequate infrastructure.			
503	Christiane	Mackie	GB13	Raises concern about the traffic impacts on roads caused by additional housing (1165 units) proposed around Pyrford and West Byfleet. Particularly due to the restricted number of bridges crossing the M25 and A3, and with traffic already very bad on Old Woking Road and Oakcroft Road. These impacts exclude those from proposals in Byfleet and Ripley, and will create an enormous burden on already inadequate infrastructure.	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
503	Christiane	Mackie	GB15	Raises concern about the traffic impacts on roads caused by additional housing (1165 units) proposed around Pyrford and West Byfleet. Particularly due to the restricted number of bridges crossing the M25 and A3, and with traffic already very bad on Old Woking Road and Oakcroft Road. These impacts exclude those from proposals in Byfleet and Ripley, and will create an enormous burden on already inadequate infrastructure.	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
503	Christiane	Mackie	GB16	Raises concern about the traffic impacts on roads caused by additional housing (1165 units) proposed around Pyrford and West Byfleet. Particularly due to the restricted number of bridges crossing the M25 and A3, and with traffic already very bad on Old Woking Road and Oakcroft Road. These impacts exclude those from proposals in Byfleet and Ripley, and will create an enormous burden on already inadequate infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation 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
503	Christiane	Mackie	GB12	Raises the historical significance and special, old English character of Pyrford and Ripley, valued by the local community and by previous Governments in awarding the area Green Belt status in the first place. Stripping the area of this status would be a crime, as Green Belt defines Surrey as a county.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</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
503	Christiane	Mackie	GB13	Raises the historical significance and special, old English character of Pyrford and Ripley, valued by the local community and by previous Governments in awarding the area Green Belt status in the first place. Stripping the area of this status would be a crime, as Green Belt defines Surrey as a county.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</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
927	K	Mackinnon	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The Council consultation has been poorly communicated, the deadline is too soon and should be extended.	None stated.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>With regards to the representation regarding the consultation process please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0</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
927	K	Mackinnon	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The Council consultation has been poorly communicated, the deadline is too soon and should be extended.	None stated.	Objection is noted.  With regards to the representation regarding the consultation process please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
927	K	Mackinnon	GB12	Concerned for the safety of the pupils of Pyrford Primary School as there are no plans to improve parking or road infrastructure. There is no controlled crossing outside the Village Hall which is used by local groups and children. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse, increasing the chance for incidents.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.  The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and safety impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
927	K	Mackinnon	GB13	Concerned for the safety of the pupils of Pyrford Primary School as there are no plans to improve parking or road infrastructure. There is no controlled crossing outside the Village Hall which is used by local groups and children. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse, increasing the chance for incidents.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.  The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.  The Local Planning Authority would recommend highlighting the current parking situation to the County Highways Authority and Woking Borough Council Parking Services to try and address the current situation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
927	K	Mackinnon	GB12	The road network will be unable to cope from further development. The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments. Parking in Waitrose has become congested. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Existing house prices are likely to fall, will the Council compensate?	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.  The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to	No further modification is 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>support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>As part of site UA51, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of part of the centre of West Byfleet. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development such as site UA51 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>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of the village and the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding property values is not a planning consideration.</p>	
927	K	Mackinnon	GB13	<p>The road network will be unable to cope from further development.</p> <p>The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.</p> <p>Parking in Waitrose has become congested.</p> <p>Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.</p> <p>Existing house prices are likely to fall, will the Council compensate?</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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>As part of site UA51, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of part of the centre of West Byfleet. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development such as site UA51 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>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of the village and the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding property values is not a planning consideration.</p>	
927	K	Mackinnon	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford as they will alter the village character of the area. Site release not recommended in GBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
927	K	Mackinnon	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford as they will alter the village character of the area. Site release not recommended in GBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB7	The GBBR Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	The Green Belt serves an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	The Green Belt serves an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	The Green Belt serves an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	The Green Belt serves an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	The Green Belt serves an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Mayford, Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	The GB provides access to the open countryside for many families. It has an important amenity and recreational function	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  In addition, Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	The GB provides access to the open countryside for many families. It has an important amenity and recreational function	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  In addition, Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	The GB provides access to the open countryside for many families. It has an important amenity and recreational function	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  In addition, Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	The GB provides access to the open countryside for many families. It has an important amenity and recreational function	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  In addition, Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	The GB provides access to the open countryside for many families. It has an important amenity and recreational function	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  In addition, Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The Council has also identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity for recreation and to mitigate development impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB7	Mayford already makes a significant contribution to the traveller community with several traveller sites in the vicinity. There is no justification for 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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	The road infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient for the level of proposed development. Mayford has narrow roads and few footpaths, three single lane bridges. There is often traffic during peak times and speed of traffic is also a concern in the area. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.	No further modification is 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.	
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	The road infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient for the level of proposed development. Mayford has narrow roads and few footpaths, three single lane bridges. There is often traffic during peak times and speed of traffic is also a concern in the area. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	The road infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient for the level of proposed development. Mayford has narrow roads and few footpaths, three single lane bridges. There is often traffic during peak times and speed of traffic is also a concern in the area. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	The road infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient for the level of proposed development. Mayford has narrow roads and few footpaths, three single lane bridges. There is often traffic during peak times and speed of traffic is also a concern in the area. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	The road infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient for the level of proposed development. Mayford has narrow roads and few footpaths, three single lane bridges. There is often traffic during peak times and speed of traffic is also a concern in the area. The proposed developments would increase the traffic and risks to pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	The area is important for drainage and alleviating rainwater in the area. Development in the area would increase surface water and increase the risk of flooding here	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	The site are important for drainage and alleviating rainwater in the area. Development in the area would increase surface water and increase the risk of flooding here	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	The site are important for drainage and alleviating rainwater in the area. Development in the area would increase surface water and increase the risk of flooding here	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	The site are important for drainage and alleviating rainwater in the area. Development in the area would increase surface water and increase the risk of flooding here	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	The site are important for drainage and alleviating rainwater in the area. Development in the area would increase surface water and increase the risk of flooding here	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. Proposals can not come forward in an area with no	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				supporting infrastructure.		<p>and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0</p>	
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. Proposals can not come forward in an area with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. Proposals can not come forward in an area with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. Proposals can not come forward in an area with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	There is a post office and barbers but no other shops, services/facilities. Proposals can not come forward in an area with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0	
328	Andrew	Macpherson	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	The proposal is in close proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath and will likely have an impact on wildlife on the heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0  In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	The proposal is in close proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath and will likely have an impact on wildlife on the heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0  In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a 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>	
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	The proposal is in close proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath and will likely have an impact on wildlife on the heath.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	The proposal is in close proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath and will likely have an impact on wildlife on the heath.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	The proposal is in close proximity to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath and will likely have an impact on wildlife on the heath.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the</p>	No further modification is 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.	
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB7	Historically, planning inspectors have refused proposals for the area 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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	The Green Belt is home to a number of wild animals. Development of the GB will destroy their habitat	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> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	The Green Belt is home to a number of wild animals. Development of the GB will destroy their habitat	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> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	The Green Belt is home to a number of wild animals. Development of the GB will destroy their habitat	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</p>	No further modification is 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>wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	The Green Belt is home to a number of wild animals. Development of the GB will destroy their habitat	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> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	The Green Belt is home to a number of wild animals. Development of the GB will destroy their habitat	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> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	The GBBR report is inconsistent.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	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
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	The GBBR report is inconsistent.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	The GBBR report is inconsistent.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	The GBBR report is inconsistent.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	The GBBR report is inconsistent.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB8	Worplesdon train station is at capacity and the limited car parking on site creates congestion during peak hours. Users have opted to use Worplesdon Station instead of Woking Station due to the parking problems. The proposals (including schemes under construction) will place even more strain on Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport are known. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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>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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB9	Worplesdon train station is at capacity and the limited car parking on site creates congestion during peak hours. Users have opted to use Worplesdon Station instead of Woking Station due to the parking problems. The proposals (including schemes under construction) will place even more strain on Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport are known. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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>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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB10	Worplesdon train station is at capacity and the limited car parking on site creates congestion during peak hours. Users have opted to use Worplesdon Station instead of Woking Station due to the parking problems. The proposals (including schemes under construction) will place even more strain on Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport are known. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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>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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB11	Worplesdon train station is at capacity and the limited car parking on site creates congestion during peak hours. Users have opted to use Worplesdon Station instead of Woking Station due to the parking problems. The proposals (including schemes under construction) will place even more strain on Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport are known. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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>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</p>	No further modification is 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 usage of the trains across the network.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 24.0	
328	Andrew	Macpherson	GB14	Worplesdon train station is at capacity and the limited car parking on site creates congestion during peak hours. Users have opted to use Worplesdon Station instead of Woking Station due to the parking problems. The proposals (including schemes under construction) will place even more strain on Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	Deficiencies in public transport are known. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.  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.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB9	Object to proposals in Mayford. Residents and visitors to the area enjoy the recreational and aesthetic qualities of the surrounding GB. It allows exploration of wildlife and recreational activities important for health and wellbeing for the young and old. It will be a shame for Mayford to lose its GB	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.  Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB10	Object to proposals in Mayford. Residents and visitors to the area enjoy the recreational and aesthetic qualities of the surrounding GB. It allows exploration of wildlife and recreational activities important for health and wellbeing for the young and old. It will be a shame for Mayford to lose its GB	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.  Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB11	Object to proposals in Mayford. Residents and visitors to the area enjoy the recreational and aesthetic qualities of the surrounding GB. It allows exploration of wildlife and recreational activities important for health and wellbeing for the young and old.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				It will be a shame for Mayford to lose its GB		<p>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>	
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB14	<p>Object to proposals in Mayford.</p> <p>Residents and visitors to the area enjoy the recreational and aesthetic qualities of the surrounding GB. It allows exploration of wildlife and recreational activities important for health and wellbeing for the young and old.</p> <p>It will be a shame for Mayford to lose its GB</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB9	Understands the housing pressure but reconsider plans for Mayford. The GB should be retained for future generations	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB10	Understands the housing pressure but reconsider plans for Mayford. The GB should be retained for future generations	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB11	Understands the housing pressure but reconsider plans for Mayford. The GB should be retained for future generations	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB14	Understands the housing pressure but reconsider plans for Mayford. The GB should be retained for future generations	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB9	<p>Saunders Lane has got progressively busier and the cars travelling quicker speeds. The proposed developments will have significant impact on traffic along Saunders Lane. Concerned that the footpaths are too narrow/ or non existent to be safe for the traffic increase and speeds.</p> <p>People choose to live in the area due to good access to London and Woking Town Centre, and accessibility appears to be one of the reasons for the site being considered; however the commute to the station and the Town Centre takes longer than the time stated and the trains are full, standing room only.</p>	None stated.	<p>In general the level of traffic experienced on road in other countries will vary for a wide variety of reasons. It is therefore unfair to draw any direct links between roads in Woking and roads in New Zealand. However the general point made regarding congestion is noted and is has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0</p> <p>In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <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
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB10	<p>Saunders Lane has got progressively busier and the cars travelling quicker speeds. The proposed developments will have significant impact on traffic along Saunders Lane. Concerned that the footpaths are too narrow/ or non existent to be safe for the traffic increase and speeds.</p> <p>People choose to live in the area due to good access to London and Woking Town Centre, and accessibility appears to be one of the reasons for the site being considered; however the commute to the station and the Town Centre takes longer than the time stated and the trains are full, standing room only.</p>	None stated.	<p>In general the level of traffic experienced on road in other countries will vary for a wide variety of reasons. It is therefore unfair to draw any direct links between roads in Woking and roads in New Zealand. However the general point made regarding congestion is noted and is has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0</p> <p>In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB11	<p>Saunders Lane has got progressively busier and the cars travelling quicker speeds. The proposed developments will have significant impact on traffic along Saunders Lane. Concerned that the footpaths are too narrow/ or non existent to be safe for the traffic increase and speeds.</p> <p>People choose to live in the area due to good access to London and Woking Town Centre, and accessibility appears to be one of the reasons for the site being considered; however the commute to the station and the Town Centre takes longer than the time stated and the trains are full, standing room only.</p>	None stated.	<p>In general the level of traffic experienced on road in other countries will vary for a wide variety of reasons. It is therefore unfair to draw any direct links between roads in Woking and roads in New Zealand. However the general point made regarding congestion is noted and is has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0</p> <p>In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <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
410	Elizabeth	Macpherson	GB14	<p>Saunders Lane has got progressively busier and the cars travelling quicker speeds. The proposed developments will have significant impact on traffic along Saunders Lane. Concerned that the footpaths are too narrow/ or non existent to be safe for the traffic increase and speeds.</p> <p>People choose to live in the area due to good access to London and Woking Town Centre, and accessibility appears to be one of the reasons for the site being considered; however the commute to the station and the Town Centre takes longer than the time stated and the trains are full, standing room only.</p>	None stated.	<p>In general the level of traffic experienced on road in other countries will vary for a wide variety of reasons. It is therefore unfair to draw any direct links between roads in Woking and roads in New Zealand. However the general point made regarding congestion is noted and is has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0</p> <p>In addition, the proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation 'key requirements', including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <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
1164	Debbie	Macpherson	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI used by residents of Mayford for leisure. Increased use of the site would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				domestic animals in close proximity. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Proposals will deprive Mayford of a beautiful area and natural habitat for wildlife. Please reconsider your plans, this will have a devastating impact on the village. Please see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy represent my views.		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	
1164	Debbie	Macpherson	GB10	I strongly object to proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The proposed developments would make Mayford a part of Woking, removing its village status. We enjoy walks in the neighbourhood looking at wildlife, plants and enjoying the serenity of the area. Green Belt serves five purposes. The construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. The proposed sites do not fulfil any of the exceptions allowed to this policy.	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 will be retained. This is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1164	Debbie	Macpherson	GB11	I strongly object to proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The proposed developments would make Mayford a part of Woking, removing its village status. We enjoy walks in the neighbourhood looking at wildlife, plants and enjoying the serenity of the area. Green Belt serves five purposes. The construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. The proposed sites do not fulfil any of the exceptions allowed to this policy.	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. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
1164	Debbie	Macpherson	GB14	I strongly object to proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The proposed developments would make Mayford a part of Woking, removing its village status. We enjoy walks in the neighbourhood looking at wildlife, plants and enjoying the serenity of the area. Green Belt serves five purposes. The construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. The proposed sites do not fulfil any of the exceptions allowed to this policy.	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
1164	Debbie	Macpherson	GB8	I strongly object to proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The proposed developments would make Mayford a part of Woking, removing its village status. We enjoy walks in the neighbourhood looking at wildlife, plants and enjoying the	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				serenity of the area. Green Belt serves five purposes. The construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. The proposed sites do not fulfil any of the exceptions allowed to this policy.		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.	
1164	Debbie	Macpherson	GB9	I strongly object to proposed housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The proposed developments would make Mayford a part of Woking, removing its village status. We enjoy walks in the neighbourhood looking at wildlife, plants and enjoying the serenity of the area. Green Belt serves five purposes. The construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. The proposed sites do not fulfil any of the exceptions allowed to this policy.	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
1164	Debbie	Macpherson	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 Matter Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB12	Supports more housing in Pyrford but not at the proposed scale. The infrastructure will not be able to support the proposals. Are there no brownfield sites in Woking for a large development such as this.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 23.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB13	Supports more housing in Pyrford but not at the proposed scale. The infrastructure will not be able to support the proposals. Are there no brownfield sites in Woking for a large development such as this.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 23.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB12	The school in the village is at capacity. Will the school be expanded or a new one built to accommodate additional children? The only option for extension would result in the loss of sports pitches. Pre-school places are also at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB13	The school in the village is at capacity. Will the school be expanded or a new one built to accommodate additional children? The only option for extension would result in the loss of sports pitches. Pre-school places are also at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB12	The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB13	The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	General	Open boarders mean more people but not everyone is sharing the load. The South of England will be covered in concrete unless someone stands up to the people that make housing targets. Stand up for the local area!	None stated.	Housing need is determined at a local level, taking into account a number of factors including natural population growth and existing housing stock. Every local planning authority in England is required to determine and set housing growth figures for their areas. In Woking's case, the housing provision is 4,964 dwellings between 2010 and 2027, or 292 dwellings per year. This figure takes into account local constraints such as flood plains, Green Belt and other environmental considerations. The Council and Core Strategy Inspector agreed that 292 dwellings per year was both suitable and achievable without causing significant negative impacts on the environment. The Council has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
695	Andy	Maddock	General	Why do we continue to build houses around the M25 when the motorways are gridlocked and trains full. Building houses wherever possible is increasing the number of people and making the situation worse. There is no thought to the impact of this and the well-being of residents and the borough in general.	None stated.	<p>The Woking Core Strategy states that most of the new development will be directed to previously developed land in the existing town, district and local centres in the Borough. This is because they offer the best access to services and community facilities. Each local authority set their own housing need based on local evidence. In Woking's case, the annual housing target is on average 292 dwellings per year. The Council agrees that infrastructure, including transport infrastructure, is needed to support development. The Council is committed to working with the various infrastructure providers to ensure that infrastructure provision meets demand. The Council has addressed infrastructure provision in more detail in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The Council has considered the impact of the Site Allocations DPD. This is set out within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which is available on the Council's website. In addition, the policies of the Core Strategy provide a robust policy framework to ensure 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
695	Andy	Maddock	GB12	The recommendations you requested do not support these plans.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB13	The recommendations you requested do not support these plans.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
695	Andy	Maddock	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. It is dangerous outside the school. Junctions around Pyrford will need to be redeveloped.	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
695	Andy	Maddock	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. It is dangerous outside the school. Junctions around Pyrford will need to be redeveloped.	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>	
710	R	Magee	General	Rejects development on Green Belt on the grounds of its negative and detrimental effect on Pyrford, Greater Woking and residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
710	R	Magee	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network, including residential roads. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</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
710	R	Magee	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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, including residential roads. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is 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.	
710	R	Magee	GB12	Green space and access to green space is part of the character of Pyrford and the loss of Green Belt would have a negative impact. There is a risk that it would become a suburb with little character, to the detriment of existing residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
710	R	Magee	GB13	Green space and access to green space is part of the character of Pyrford and the loss of Green Belt would have a negative impact. There is a risk that it would become a suburb with little character, to the detriment of existing residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
710	R	Magee	General	Objects to loss of Green Belt for housing and Travellers sites. Particularly object to Green Belt development in Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
53	Graham	Maguire	GB13	Strong objection to the use of green field site for the building of houses. Main concern is the pressure on the infrastructure system which is already very busy and at times has serious hold ups.	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
53	Graham	Maguire	GB13	Remember to observe and follow the five stated purposes of Green Belt land.	None stated.	The proposed sites has been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt in the Green Belt boundary review. The Green Belt boundary review and other evidence has been used to inform the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB5	Green Belt in this area should be preserved as should sites in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.  It should be noted that the proposed allocation includes residential accommodation, of which 50% would be required to be affordable and publically accessible open space. In combination with other proposed allocations, the Council takes the view that it is meeting the needs of the existing communities and future generations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB4	Green Belt in this area should be preserved as should sites in the wider area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.  It should be noted that the proposed allocation includes residential accommodation, of which 50% would be required to be affordable, publically accessible open space as well as possible	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						accommodation for older persons. In combination with other proposed allocations, the Council takes the view that it is meeting the needs of the existing communities and future generations.	
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	HRA Screening of Woking Site Allocations	Supporting	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	Cumulative impacts	Supporting - I believe already explained in my previous statement	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB4	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB5	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB4	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and the facility in West Byfleet is difficult to access with parking and congestion issues.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing congestion and parking issues at West Byfleet District Centre have been considered under Site UA51, which seeks to deliver the comprehensive redevelopment of this part of West Byfleet District Centre and improvements to car parking and access. The representation regarding traffic and congestion more generally 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
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB5	Byfleet has no medical facilities at present and the facility in West Byfleet is difficult to access with parking and congestion issues.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing congestion and parking issues at West Byfleet District Centre have been considered under Site UA51, which seeks to deliver the comprehensive redevelopment of this part of West Byfleet District Centre and improvements to car parking and access. The representation regarding traffic and congestion more generally 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
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB4	Increase population with police cut backs are a bad idea and more schools are required	None stated.	<p>The Police service have been consulted during the consultation period. As noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p> <p>The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
705	Bernadette	Mahoney	GB5	Increase population with police cut backs are a bad idea and more schools are required	None stated.	<p>The Police service have been consulted during the consultation period. As noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p> <p>The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB8	Wildlife. The rep identifies the irony of accommodating the WWF headquarters in Woking and putting forward proposals on GB that will wipe out acres of precious wildlife habitats. More effort should be placed on working with nature and helping it to thrive, particularly protected wildlife and habitats. Hook Heath Escarpment is the nest site for various birds including Buzzar. The success of the site is down to good food supply and lack of human interference. Proposals would result in the destruction of trees which will impact on the Buzzar habitat and food supply.	None stated.	<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. It is proud to be the home to the WWF headquarters. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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</p>	No further modification is 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 key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB9	Wildlife. The rep identifies the irony of accommodating the WWF headquarters in Woking and putting forward proposals on GB that will wipe out acres of precious wildlife habitats. More effort should be placed on working with nature and helping it to thrive, particularly protected wildlife and habitats. Hook Heath Escarpment is the nest site for various birds including Buzzar. The success of the site is down to good food supply and lack of human interference. Proposals would result in the destruction of trees which will impact on the Buzzar habitat and food supply.	None stated.	<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. It is proud to be the home to the WWF headquarters. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB10	Wildlife. The rep identifies the irony of accommodating the WWF headquarters in Woking and putting forward proposals on GB that will wipe out acres of precious wildlife habitats. More effort should be placed on working with nature and helping it to thrive, particularly protected wildlife and habitats. Hook Heath Escarpment is the nest site for various birds including Buzzar. The success of the site is down to good food supply and lack of human interference. Proposals would result in the destruction of trees which will impact on the Buzzar habitat and food supply.	None stated.	<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. It is proud to be the home to the WWF headquarters. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB11	Wildlife. The rep identifies the irony of accommodating the WWF headquarters in Woking and putting forward proposals on GB that will wipe out acres of precious wildlife habitats. More effort should be placed on working with nature and helping it to thrive, particularly protected wildlife and habitats. Hook Heath Escarpment is the nest site for various birds including Buzzar. The success of the site is down to good food supply and lack of human interference. Proposals would result in the destruction of trees which will impact on the Buzzar habitat and food supply.	None stated.	<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. It is proud to be the home to the WWF headquarters. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB14	Wildlife. The rep identifies the irony of accommodating the WWF headquarters in Woking and putting forward proposals on GB that will wipe out acres of precious wildlife habitats. More effort should be placed on working with nature and helping it to thrive, particularly protected wildlife and habitats.	None stated.	<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. It is proud to be the home to the WWF headquarters. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Hook Heath Escarpment is the nest site for various birds including Buzzar. The success of the site is down to good food supply and lack of human interference. Proposals would result in the destruction of trees which will impact on the Buzzar habitat and food supply.		<p>Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB9	<p>Proposals will increase urban sprawl, a fundamental purpose of the GB. Woking will increasing spread southwards towards Guildford. The Site Allocation DPD refers to the new GB boundary. The GB boundary has already been established and is still relevant; it should be retained- as set out on the Daily Telegraph website.</p> <p>Woking is already heavily urbanised.</p> <p>The DPD refers to green corridors but there are no protected Green Belt corridors in Woking.</p> <p>Text on P299 suggests there will be no adverse impact on the escarpment. Disagrees with this, the proposed development will totally adversely and irreversibly affect the integrity of the escarpment. The escarpment will disappear from the majority of viewpoints. It is irresponsible to pretend that there would be no impact on the environment, landscape, pollution levels when it will.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The interactive map shown on the Daily Telegraph does not show the full picture, it only focuses on the designated green belt areas within it. It does not show the areas between which will comprise of brownfield and green field land of open countryside .</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 the Escarpment, please see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The key requirements also sets out site specific requirements to protect tree belts and supports the creation of green corridors where the opportunity arises.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB10	<p>Proposals will increase urban sprawl, a fundamental purpose of the GB. Woking will increasing spread southwards towards Guildford. The Site Allocation DPD refers to the new GB boundary. The GB boundary has already been established and is still relevant; it should be retained- as set out on the Daily Telegraph website.</p> <p>Woking is already heavily urbanised.</p> <p>The DPD refers to green corridors but there are no protected Green Belt corridors in Woking.</p> <p>Text on P299 suggests there will be no adverse impact on the escarpment. Disagrees with this, the proposed development will totally adversely and irreversibly affect the integrity of the escarpment. The escarpment will disappear from the majority of viewpoints. It is irresponsible to pretend that there would be no impact on the environment, landscape, pollution levels when it will.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The interactive map shown on the Daily Telegraph does not show the full picture, it only focuses on the designated green belt areas within it. It does not show the areas between which will comprise of brownfield and green field land of open countryside .</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 the Escarpment, please see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The key requirements also sets out site specific requirements to protect tree belts and supports the creation of green corridors where the opportunity arises.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB11	<p>Proposals will increase urban sprawl, a fundamental purpose of the GB. Woking will increasing spread southwards towards Guildford. The Site Allocation DPD refers to the new GB boundary. The GB boundary has already been established and is still relevant; it should be retained- as set out on the Daily Telegraph website.</p> <p>Woking is already heavily urbanised.</p> <p>The DPD refers to green corridors but there are no protected Green Belt corridors in Woking.</p> <p>Text on P299 suggests there will be no adverse impact on the escarpment. Disagrees with this, the proposed development will totally adversely and irreversibly affect the integrity of the escarpment. The escarpment will disappear from the majority of viewpoints. It is irresponsible to pretend that there would be no impact on the environment, landscape, pollution levels when it will.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The interactive map shown on the Daily Telegraph does not show the full picture, it only focuses on the designated green belt areas within it. It does not show the areas between which will comprise of brownfield and green field land of open countryside .</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 the Escarpment, please see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The key requirements also sets out site specific requirements to protect tree belts and supports the creation of green corridors where the opportunity arises.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB14	Proposals will increase urban sprawl, a fundamental purpose of the GB. Woking will increasing spread southwards towards Guildford. The Site Allocation DPD refers to the new GB boundary. The GB boundary has already been established and is still relevant; it should be retained- as set out on the Daily Telegraph website. Woking is already heavily urbanised. The DPD refers to green corridors but there are no protected Green Belt corridors in Woking. Text on P299 suggests there will be no adverse impact on the escarpment. Disagrees with this, the proposed development will totally adversely and irreversibly affect the integrity of the escarpment. The escarpment will disappear from the majority of viewpoints. It is irresponsible to pretend that there would be no impact on the environment, landscape, pollution levels when it will.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 12.0 and 15.0.  The interactive map shown on the Daily Telegraph does not show the full picture, it only focuses on the designated green belt areas within it. It does not show the areas between which will comprise of brownfield and green field land of open countryside .  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.  With respect to the Escarpment, please see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.  The key requirements also sets out site specific requirements to protect tree belts and supports the creation of green corridors where the opportunity arises.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB8	The Core Strategy policy requires development proposals to make positive benefits to the landscape and townscape character. This appears to have been ignored in relation to the proposals around Mayford/Hook Heath and the Hook Heath Escarpment.	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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB9	The Core Strategy policy requires development proposals to make positive benefits to the landscape and townscape character. This appears to have been ignored in relation to the proposals around Mayford/Hook Heath and the Hook Heath Escarpment.	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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB10	The Core Strategy policy requires development proposals to make positive benefits to the landscape and townscape character. This appears to have been ignored in relation to the proposals around Mayford/Hook Heath and the Hook Heath Escarpment.	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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB11	The Core Strategy policy requires development proposals to make positive benefits to the landscape and townscape character. This appears to have been ignored in relation to the proposals around Mayford/Hook Heath and the Hook Heath Escarpment.	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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB14	The Core Strategy policy requires development proposals to make positive benefits to the landscape and townscape character. This appears to have been ignored in relation to the proposals around Mayford/Hook Heath and the Hook Heath Escarpment.	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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB8	There are serious flaws in the GBBR. The assessment in the GBBR provides the main justification for important decisions yet it has not been consulted on. The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. The assessment appears to recognise the lack of facilities at the Local Centre as it states that the land should include a local centre. So all the supporting infrastructure will have to be built as well as housing.	None stated.	The GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.  The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3, Section 10, and Section 17.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB9	There are serious flaws in the GBBR. The assessment in the GBBR provides the main justification for important decisions yet it has not been consulted on. The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. The assessment appears to recognise the lack of facilities at the Local Centre as it states that the land should include a local centre. So all the supporting infrastructure will have to be built as well as housing.	None stated.	<p>The GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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, Section 10, and Section 17.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB10	There are serious flaws in the GBBR. The assessment in the GBBR provides the main justification for important decisions yet it has not been consulted on. The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. The assessment appears to recognise the lack of facilities at the Local Centre as it states that the land should include a local centre. So all the supporting infrastructure will have to be built as well as housing.	None stated.	<p>The GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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, Section 10, and Section 17.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB11	There are serious flaws in the GBBR. The assessment in the GBBR provides the main justification for important decisions yet it has not been consulted on. The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. The assessment appears to recognise the lack of facilities at the Local Centre as it states that the land should include a local centre. So all the supporting infrastructure will have to be built as well as housing.	None stated.	<p>The GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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, Section 10, and Section 17.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB14	There are serious flaws in the GBBR. The assessment in the GBBR provides the main justification for important decisions yet it has not been consulted on. The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. The assessment appears to recognise the lack of	None stated.	<p>The GBBR is a technical document and is one of many documents that forms the evidence base that informs the draft Site Allocation DPD. Public consultation was not undertaken on the individual evidence base but on the Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				facilities at the Local Centre as it states that the land should include a local centre. So all the supporting infrastructure will have to be built as well as housing.		<p>and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3, Section 10, and Section 17.</p>	
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB8	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded, they are already heavily congested at rush hour. The traffic from the proposed residential, retail park and leisure centre will exacerbate traffic problems. This will not add to the appeal of Woking.	None stated.	<p>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.</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 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB9	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded, they are already heavily congested at rush hour. The traffic from the proposed residential, retail park and leisure centre will exacerbate traffic problems. This will not add to the appeal of Woking.	None stated.	<p>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.</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 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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB10	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded, they are already heavily congested at rush hour. The traffic from the proposed residential, retail park and leisure centre will exacerbate traffic problems. This will not add to the appeal of Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB11	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded, they are already heavily congested at rush hour. The traffic from the proposed residential, retail park and leisure centre will exacerbate traffic problems. This will not add to the appeal of Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB14	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded, they are already heavily congested at rush hour. The traffic from the proposed residential, retail park and leisure centre will exacerbate traffic problems. This will not add to the appeal of Woking.	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 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB8	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. The Core Strategy does not identify the need for this. The Council should be arguing to prevent development on GB not build on the land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB9	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. The Core Strategy does not identify the need for this. The Council should be arguing to prevent development on GB not build on the land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB10	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. The Core Strategy does not identify the need for this. The Council should be arguing to prevent development on GB not build on the land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB11	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. The Core Strategy does not identify the need for this. The Council should be arguing to prevent development on GB not build on the land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB14	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. The Core Strategy does not identify the need for this. The Council should be arguing to prevent development on GB not build on the land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB8	The character of the unique and historic village will be lost. Development will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 12.0 and 23.0.</p>	
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB9	The character of the unique and historic village will be lost. Development will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB10	The character of the unique and historic village will be lost. Development will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB11	The character of the unique and historic village will be lost. Development will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB14	The character of the unique and historic village will be lost. Development will fill in open spaces between Woking and Mayford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also 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
1233	Robin, Charlotte	Maidment	GB8	Proposals will increase urban sprawl, a fundamental purpose of the GB. Woking will increasing spread southwards towards Guildford. The Site Allocation DPD refers to the new GB boundary. The GB boundary has already been established and is still relevant; it should be retained- as set out on the Daily Telegraph website. Woking is already heavily urbanised. The DPD refers to green corridors but there are no protected Green Belt corridors in Woking. Text on P299 suggests there will be no adverse impact on the escarpment. Disagrees with this, the proposed development will totally adversely and irreversibly affect the	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The interactive map shown on the Daily Telegraph does not show the full picture, it only focuses on the designated green belt areas within it. It does not show the areas between which will comprise of brownfield and green field land of open countryside .</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 the Escarpment, please 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				integrity of the escarpment. The escarpment will disappear from the majority of viewpoints. It is irresponsible to pretend that there would be no impact on the environment, landscape, pollution levels when it will.		The key requirements also sets out site specific requirements to protect tree belts and supports the creation of green corridors where the opportunity arises.	
414	Paul	Mailey	GB4	Object. Needs a complete rethink	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
414	Paul	Mailey	GB5	Object. No thought whatsoever in this appraisal	None stated.	Objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
414	Paul	Mailey	GB4	The proposals for new homes between the A3 and Woking will have a serious effect on infrastructure	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
414	Paul	Mailey	GB5	Parvis Road is often congested and will become unusable. Cancel The plans	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
1624	N	Majid	UA33	Walton Road and the surrounding roads are densely populated with a high population of local residents. Road access can be difficult and dangerous. The proposal will make the situation worse.	None stated.	Walton Road and the adjacent roads are located within the High Density Residential Area, as defined on the Proposals Map. Generally, development in this area will be permitted at densities in excess of 70dph in order to make the most efficient use of land. The proposed allocation is located within Woking Town Centre and is the preferred location for town centre uses and high density residential development, as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2: Woking Town Centre and CS10: Housing provision and distribution. Although increased densities have the potential of having a negative impact on traffic, parking and congestion, the site is located within a sustainable location, with good access to a wide range of services, facilities and public transport. The proposed allocated site is also located within the Woking Town Centre High Accessibility Area, as defined within the Parking Standards SPD (2006). A reduced parking standard is acceptable in this location due to the reasonable walking time to and from Woking Station. Therefore the proposed allocation is not expected to have a significant impact on traffic, parking and congestion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA36	Walton Road and the surrounding roads are densely populated with a high population of local residents. Road access can be difficult and dangerous. The proposal will make the situation worse.	None stated.	Walton Road and the adjacent roads are located within the High Density Residential Area, as defined on the Proposals Map. Generally, development in this area will be permitted at densities in excess of 70dph in order to make the most efficient use of land. The proposed allocation is also located within Walton Road Neighbourhood Centre and is the preferred location for town centre uses and some residential development, as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS4: Local and neighbourhood centres and shopping parades and CS10: Housing provision and distribution. Although increased densities have the potential of having a negative impact on traffic, parking and congestion, the site is located within a sustainable location, with good access to a wide range of services, facilities and public transport. The proposed allocated site is also located within the Woking Town Centre High Accessibility Area, as defined within	No further modification is 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 Parking Standards SPD (2006). A reduced parking standard is acceptable in this location due to the reasonable walking time to and from Woking Station. Therefore the proposed allocation is not expected to have a significant impact on traffic, parking and congestion.	
1624	N	Majid	UA38	Walton Road and the surrounding roads are densely populated with a high population of local residents. Road access can be difficult and dangerous. The proposal will make the situation worse.	None stated.	Walton Road and the adjacent roads are located within the High Density Residential Area, as defined on the Proposals Map. Generally, development in this area will be permitted at densities in excess of 70dph in order to make the most efficient use of land. The proposed allocation is also located within Walton Road Neighbourhood Centre and is the preferred location for town centre uses and some residential development, as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS4: Local and neighbourhood centres and shopping parades and CS10: Housing provision and distribution. Although increased densities have the potential of having a negative impact on traffic, parking and congestion, the site is located within a sustainable location, with good access to a wide range of services, facilities and public transport. The proposed allocated site is also located within the Woking Town Centre High Accessibility Area, as defined within the Parking Standards SPD (2006). A reduced parking standard is acceptable in this location due to the reasonable walking time to and from Woking Station. Therefore the proposed allocation is not expected to have a significant impact on traffic, parking and congestion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA33	Windows will generate glare.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) set out policy and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites does not have a negative impact on the micro-climate including glare from windows. This could be in the form of a Shadowing and Reflection Analysis as part of a detailed planning application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA33	Council decisions always favour the Planners rather than residents. This is unfair on residents as they have to experience the negative impacts of development. The proposals along Chertsey Road are out of proportion and over-bearing.	None stated.	<p>The planning system enables the community to make representations on planning applications and during the plan making process. The Council has a duty to take these representations into consideration and demonstrate how the comments have informed the Council's decisions.</p> <p>As part of the plan making process, impact of the proposed allocations has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental, social and economical indicators.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The Core Strategy also highlights that development will be encouraged in the existing urban areas of the Borough as they offer good accessibility to existing services and facilities. This includes the intensification of land uses where local character and appearance are not adversely affected. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1 and CS21.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA36	Council decisions always favour the Planners rather than residents. This is unfair on residents as they have to experience the negative impacts of development. The proposals along Chertsey Road are out of proportion and over-bearing.	None stated.	<p>The planning system enables the community to make representations on planning applications and during the plan making process. The Council has a duty to take these representations into consideration and demonstrate how the comments have informed the Council's decisions.</p> <p>As part of the plan making process, impact of the proposed allocations has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental, social and economical indicators.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Core Strategy also highlights that development will be encouraged in the existing urban areas of the Borough as they offer good accessibility to existing services and facilities. This includes the intensification of land uses where local character and appearance are not adversely affected. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1 and CS21.	
1624	N	Majid	UA38	Council decisions always favour the Planners rather than residents. This is unfair on residents as they have to experience the negative impacts of development. The proposals along Chertsey Road are out of proportion and over-bearing.	None stated.	<p>The planning system enables the community to make representations on planning applications and during the plan making process. The Council has a duty to take these representations into consideration and demonstrate how the comments have informed the Council's decisions.</p> <p>As part of the plan making process, impact of the proposed allocations has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental, social and economical indicators.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The Core Strategy also highlights that development will be encouraged in the existing urban areas of the Borough as they offer good accessibility to existing services and facilities. This includes the intensification of land uses where local character and appearance are not adversely affected. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1 and CS21.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA33	Residential gardens will be of no use as they are not considered in determining any proposal and the proposal will have a negative impact on it.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight. This has also been clearly set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA33	How is the proposal in keeping with the adjacent residential character.	None stated.	The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA36	How is the proposal in keeping with the adjacent residential character.	None stated.	The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA38	How is the proposal in keeping with the adjacent residential character.	None stated.	The Core Strategy, the emerging Development Management Policies DPD and the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites is of high standard and sympathetic to the general character of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						significantly undermined.	
1624	N	Majid	UA33	All of the proposals will result in residents having to endure years of noise, dust, pollution, traffic and disruption.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA36	All of the proposals will result in residents having to endure years of noise, dust, pollution, traffic and disruption.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA38	All of the proposals will result in residents having to endure years of noise, dust, pollution, traffic and disruption.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA36	Pollution will increase affecting peoples quality of life and health.	None stated.	The site is adjacent to Woking Town Centre and within Walton Road Neighbourhood Centre and therefore in close proximity to sustainable modes of transport including Woking Railway Station and bus services. It also provides opportunities to walk to key services, jobs and shops and therefore reduces the likelihood of congestion, and subsequently air pollution from traffic.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA38	Pollution will increase affecting peoples quality of life and health.	None stated.	The site is adjacent to Woking Town Centre and within Walton Road Neighbourhood Centre and therefore in close proximity to sustainable modes of transport including Woking Railway Station and bus services. It also provides opportunities to walk to key services, jobs and shops and therefore reduces the likelihood of congestion, and subsequently air pollution from traffic.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA33	Pollution will increase affecting peoples quality of life and health.	None stated.	The site is in Woking Town Centre and in close proximity to sustainable modes of transport including Woking Railway Station and bus services. It also provides opportunities to walk to key services, jobs and shops and therefore reduces the likelihood of congestion, and subsequently air pollution from traffic.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA33	The proposal will result in the loss of privacy and create overlooking to adjacent residential properties.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1624	N	Majid	UA33	The height of the proposals will have a negative impact on daylight and sunlight levels to adjacent residential properties.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight. This has also been clearly set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	<p>The B367 and Upshot Lane priority junction is already congested-the existing issues may indicate that it would be unsuitable</p> <p>Potential access problems on GB12 due to the substantial vegetation. The removal of substantial vegetation and trees to achieve access would be a concern.</p> <p>Could consider a roundabout at the priority junction however this would require substantial tree loss and the area is considered of archaeological importance.</p> <p>Pedestrian access would be a concern due to the lack of footways and speed of traffic along these roads</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 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The key requirements also require the retention or reprovion of boundary planting on Upshot Lane and the retention of mature trees of amenity value on the site.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes the archaeological potential of the site and requires an archaeological investigation be undertaken.</p>	
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	<p>The B367 and Upshot Lane priority junction is already congested-the existing issues may indicate that it would be unsuitable</p> <p>Potential access problems on GB12 due to the substantial vegetation. The removal of substantial vegetation and trees to achieve access would be a concern.</p> <p>Could consider a roundabout at the priority junction however this would require substantial tree loss and the area is considered of archaeological importance.</p> <p>Pedestrian access would be a concern due to the lack of footways and speed of traffic along these roads</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 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> <p>The key requirements also require the retention or reprovion of boundary planting on Upshot Lane and the retention of mature trees of amenity value on the site.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes the archaeological potential of the site and requires an archaeological investigation be undertaken.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	Concerned that the draft Site Allocation DPD was approved at the Executive without fully taking into account representations received from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and LDA Design. The letter submitted argued that the draft Site Allocation DPD was not based on robust evidence base and recommended that the comments be taken into account before the approval of the draft Site Allocation for public consultation	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19.</p> <p>It is correct that Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. The Council responded to all of the questions asked at the same meeting and these were minuted.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	Concerned that the draft Site Allocation DPD was approved at the Executive without fully taking into account representations received from Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and LDA Design. The letter submitted argued that the draft Site Allocation DPD was not based on robust evidence base and recommended that the comments be taken into account before the approval of the draft Site Allocation for public consultation	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19.</p> <p>It is correct that Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. The Council responded to all of the questions asked at the same meeting and these were minuted.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	The proposals for West Hall, West Byfleet conflicts with national GB policy. National policy sets out the various functions of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0 and Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	There are conflicts with the Core Strategy and SA objectives as a result of needing to protect the purpose of the GB and identifying sufficient need	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0. See also paragraph 1.13, Section 9.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the objectives of the sustainability appraisal for the draft Site Allocation DPD are consistent with those of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	There are conflicts with the Core Strategy and SA objectives as a result of needing to protect the purpose of the GB and identifying sufficient need	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0. See also paragraph 1.13, Section 9.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the objectives of the sustainability appraisal for the draft Site Allocation DPD are consistent with those of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	Need to consider the ecological impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	Need to consider the ecological impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	The Green Belt provides a natural noise and amenity buffer between the Motorway and houses along Parvis Road	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt serves five purposes as set out in the NPPF. The main aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl. As a consequence this may create open areas which act as a noise buffer , however sites were not assessed for its ability to achieve this as it is not a primary Green Belt function.</p> <p>Nevertheless, proposals will be required to meet all other Development Plan policies. Including Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, emerging Development Management Policies, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. These include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites avoid significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	Development of GB12 and GB13 will have an impact on various heritage assets in the vicinity, including Pyrford Court and various buildings in Wheelers Farm. The landscape provides an important setting for heritage assets including Pyrford Court Registered Park and Garden and the listed buildings- development could erode the landscape particularly along Pyrford Common Road and Upshot Lane. GB12 and GB13 form part of the Conservation Area and historic maps show the fields were previously farmed by local residents.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and 7.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design 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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	Development of GB12 and GB13 will have an impact on various heritage assets in the vicinity, including Pyrford Court and various buildings in Wheelers Farm. The landscape provides an important setting for heritage assets including Pyrford Court Registered Park and Garden	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and 7.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design 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
				and the listed buildings- development could erode the landscape particularly along Pyrford Common Road and Upshot Lane. GB12 and GB13 form part of the Conservation Area and historic maps show the fields were previously farmed by local residents.			
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	Requests joined up, responsible thinking in terms of development in GB15 and GB16	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB16	Requests joined up, responsible thinking in terms of development in GB15 and GB16	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	Concerned that if GB15 comes forward for development that there would be no GB left in West Byfleet	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	WBC have required the "preservation of the character and quality of the setting of the Borough" and that "an assessment of the landscape character and sensitivity to change of developing the various parcels of land was undertaken to ensure that the landscape character of area and the setting of the Borough are not compromised." The proposed use will conflict with this.	None stated.	The need to remove Green Belt land to meet housing need has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0  With respect to concerns regarding impact on the landscape and townscape character this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	Concern about the increase of traffic along Parvis Road as a result of the proposal. Parvis road is already heavily used and is often congested due to its location between the A3 and M25. The position of the site means the entrance and egress is likely to be along Parvis Road. This coupled with the continued development of Brooklands (Elmbridge BC) and redevelopment of Broadoaks site (GB16) will make Parvis Road unpassable. Which would subsequently block access to the emergency services.  The Transport Evaluation conducted in 2010 does not take into account proposal for GB15 and therefore can not prove there would be no impact on the road infrastructure. The report only considers scenarios around Worplesdon Station and Sutton Green.	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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB16	Concern about the increase of traffic along Parvis Road as a result of the proposal. Parvis road is already heavily used and is often congested due to its location between the A3 and M25. The position of the site means the entrance and egress is	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.	No further modification is 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>likely to be along Parvis Road. This coupled with the continued development of Brooklands (Elmbridge BC) and redevelopment of Broadoaks site (GB16) will make Parvis Road unpassable. Which would subsequently block access to the emergency services.</p> <p>The Transport Evaluation conducted in 2010 does not take into account proposal for GB15 and therefore can not prove there would be no impact on the road infrastructure. The report only considers scenarios around Worplesdon Station and Sutton Green.</p>		<p>These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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>	
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	Need to consider the local infrastructure impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	Need to consider the local infrastructure impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	<p>Proposals will place additional strain on the existing infrastructure including schools, healthcare and the provision of utilities .</p> <p>Attention is drawn to WBC IDP which indicates that in West Byfleet has shortages in school places; health care at capacity; is an area of severe water supply stress and contains extensive areas at flood risk.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>Schools: Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8 Flooding: Section 5.0 Water utilities: paragraph 3.9</p> <p>The IDP notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. See also the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	The development of GB15 should be considered in context. It is adjacent Broadoaks (GB16), which itself could be an asset West Byfleet if redeveloped in a sensitive manner. However the both proposals will have significant impact on the local highways and infrastructure.	None stated.	<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> <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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
311	Ian	Makowski	GB16	The development of GB15 should be considered in context. It is adjacent Broadoaks (GB16), which itself could be an asset West Byfleet if redeveloped in a sensitive manner. However the both proposals will have significant impact on the local highways, infrastructure and utilities.	None stated.	<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> <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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	<p>Various landscape impact issues have been highlighted GB12 contains substantial vegetation and is covered by TPOs</p> <p>GB13 is south-east facing slope with open with views to the Wey Valley and surrounding views including the Surrey Hills AONB</p> <p>Development on GB12 and GB13 would result in the loss of sensitive landscape views</p> <p>GB12 and GB13 provide an uninterrupted countryside between town and river valley. They perform an important function of containing development</p> <p>GB12 and GB13 are rare examples of rural landscape which have not been degraded by golf courses</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24, CS17, emerging Development Management Policies 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 and the retention of trees of important amenity or environmental value.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	<p>Various landscape impact issues have been highlighted GB12 contains substantial vegetation and is covered by TPOs</p> <p>GB13 is south-east facing slope with open with views to the Wey Valley and surrounding views including the Surrey Hills AONB</p> <p>Development on GB12 and GB13 would result in the loss of sensitive landscape views</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24, CS17, emerging Development Management Policies 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 and the retention of trees of important amenity or environmental value.</p> <p>The key requirements note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				GB12 and GB13 provide an uninterrupted countryside between town and river valley. They perform an important function of containing development GB12 and GB13 are rare examples of rural landscape which have not been degraded by golf courses		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 Section 7.0	
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	The Wey Navigation is of historic value and an important form of public open space, enjoyed by walkers, runners and cyclists. It is also an important wildlife corridor. Development proposal for GB15 will have a significant impact on the Wey Navigation.	None stated.	The value of the Wey Navigation as an important green corridor is acknowledged. The proposal text emphasises this and requires a buffer along the corridor to protect its distinctive character and wildlife value.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0, 23.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	The response critically assesses the methodology and conclusions in the GBBR particularly: - The GBBR seems to suggest that GB12 and GB13 do form a critical GB purpose, which suggests they shouldn't be considered for removal -GB13 is particularly sensitive in landscape terms, -GB12 and GB13 are sieved out and then reconsidered because of their availability - this is not identified as a criteria in the methodology -several alternative sites performed better than GB12 and GB13 (Parcels 7,13, 2 and 28) in terms of suitability and sustainability -sites have not been assessed equally -purpose 4 of the GB, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns has been ignored in the assessment as it was not considered relevant to Woking. - the conclusions in the GBBR are not consistent with the conclusions in the SA	None stated.	This representation regarding the various aspects of the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0, 9.0 and 8.0.  The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	The response critically assesses the methodology and conclusions in the GBBR particularly: - The GBBR seems to suggest that GB12 and GB13 do form a critical GB purpose, which suggests they shouldn't be considered for removal -GB13 is particularly sensitive in landscape terms, -GB12 and GB13 are sieved out and then reconsidered because of their availability - this is not identified as a criteria in the methodology -several alternative sites performed better than GB12 and GB13 (Parcels 7,13, 2 and 28) in terms of suitability and sustainability -sites have not been assessed equally -purpose 4 of the GB, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns has been ignored in the assessment as it was not considered relevant to Woking.	None stated.	This representation regarding the various aspects of the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0, 9.0 and 8.0.  The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				- the conclusions in the GBBR are not consistent with the conclusions in the SA			
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	<p>The rep suggests that the SA is not robust, relying heavily on the GBBR but with no further evidence to justify the decisions made.</p> <p>It is also considered that the Site Allocation DPD is inconsistent in how it utilises the GBBR and SA. Therefore is unsound</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0. See also paragraph 1.13, Section 9.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	<p>The rep suggests that the SA is not robust, relying heavily on the GBBR but with no further evidence to justify the decisions made.</p> <p>It is also considered that the Site Allocation DPD is inconsistent in how it utilises the GBBR and SA. Therefore is unsound</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	For development to be sustainable it should meet the criteria set. It is not considered that GB15 addresses all of these issues and can not be considered sustainable development	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>See Section 5.0 and paragraph 4.10-Flooding;</p> <p>See Section paragraph 1.6, Section 11.0, Section 16.0, and Section 18.0-efficient use of land and buildings;</p> <p>See paragraph 7.4-7.5, Section 23.0, paragraph 4.10, paragraph 3.1 and paragraph 3.7 - landscapes, habitats, flora and fauna;</p> <p>See paragraph 4.10- pollution levels: air, water, light, noise;</p> <p>See paragraph 1.13, Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.2, 3.3, 8.1, Section 20- transport</p> <p>See Section 7.0, particularly paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0- Heritage</p> <p>See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.1, 3.2, and 3.7- open space and recreation;</p> <p>See Section 3.0-infrastructure;</p> <p>There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The Council is satisfied that the proposals do promote economic growth. Proposals include commercial development and mixed use proposals in the Town Centre and sites are situated close to services and facilities. New residential development would also introduce more consumers to the local centres.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	<p>The Council states that the draft Site Allocation DPD is based on the SA and GBBR, however the response picks up various conflicts between the SA and GBBR.</p> <p>-GB13 is not considered suitable for release in the GBBR but is a preferred site in the SA</p> <p>-Parcel 7 is rejected in the SA even though the GBBR considers as a potential safeguarded site</p> <p>-the Council rejected the GBBR recommendations for rationalisation because it considered the boundary to be "clear and defensible"</p> <p>-the SA is a separate exercise to the GBBR and assessed other reasonable alternative sites in the SHLAA and ELR, however it did not assess Parcel 31 in the GBBR even though it ranked higher than Parcel 9 in the GBBR.</p>	None stated.	<p>The various issues raised in this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 8.0 and 9.0.</p> <p>The combined information from the substantial evidence base provide a sufficient basis to make informed judgements about the proposed allocation</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	<p>The Council states that the draft Site Allocation DPD is based on the SA and GBBR, however the response picks up various conflicts between the SA and GBBR.</p> <p>-GB13 is not considered suitable for release in the GBBR but is a preferred site in the SA</p> <p>-Parcel 7 is rejected in the SA even though the GBBR considers as a potential safeguarded site</p> <p>-the Council rejected the GBBR recommendations for rationalisation because it considered the boundary to be "clear and defensible"</p> <p>-the SA is a separate exercise to the GBBR and assessed other reasonable alternative sites in the SHLAA and ELR, however it did not assess Parcel 31 in the GBBR even though it ranked higher than Parcel 9 in the GBBR.</p>	None stated.	<p>The various issues raised in this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 8.0 and 9.0.</p> <p>The combined information from the substantial evidence base provide a sufficient basis to make informed judgements about the proposed allocation</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	The Dodd's Lane track is an important beauty spot, frequented by cyclists, dog walkers, runners etc. It should be protected	None stated.	The proposed allocation of GB15 (Land surrounding West Hall) does not alter the existing Dodd's Lane track. As noted under the key requirements for the site, development design should additionally have regard to the existing footpath network. The pedestrian access from Dodd's Lane to the Wey Navigation should therefore be unaffected by the proposal and will continue to serve as a public right of way.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	The response seeks to demonstrate that the GBBR is flawed and therefore, given that it informs the Site Allocation DPD, the evidence base in not considered robust.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	The response seeks to demonstrate that the GBBR is flawed and therefore, given that it informs the Site Allocation DPD, the evidence base in not considered robust.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	The IDP does not assess the potential flood risk associated with the development of GB15 in enough depth. Given its proximity to the Wey Navigation, material consideration should be given to flooding and surface water management	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not assess flood risk. The Council has a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment that does this, this was updated in 2015. Concerns about flooding have been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and paragraph 4.10-Flooding;	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB15	The area is subject to seasonal flooding and therefore plays a part in flood management.	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
311	Ian	Makowski	GB12	Need to consider water resource and hydrological impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, paragraph 3.9-3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
311	Ian	Makowski	GB13	Need to consider water resource and hydrological impacts of development on GB12 and GB13.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, paragraph 3.9-3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
447	Marion	Malcher	General	The NPPF states that a Green Belt review should happen in exceptional circumstances. The GBBR proposed the removal of Common Land, Nature Reserves, Allotments, Recreation Grounds despite residents having paid for this in Council Tax. Object to procedures taken in preparing the DPD, in particular no public consultation on the GBBR.	None stated.	The exceptional circumstances case is explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1. 9 - 1.11.  The Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) made a number of recommendations and although most have been broadly followed not all the recommendations were followed taking into account all other available evidence. Further explanation on the GBBR methodology can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
447	Marion	Malcher	General	Object to proposals due to impact on Biodiversity. Policy CS7 defines 'biodiversity' (although does not mention the interaction of species or recognise that human form part of the ecosystem). CS7 sets out that development should seek to requirement for proposals to maintain, restore and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interest. Expanding the built environment is the antithesis of promoting biodiversity.	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
447	Marion	Malcher	General	Object to the removal of GB for development. The GB performs multiple functions, including preventing urban sprawl, mitigating the effects of climate change, biodiversity and food growing. Proposals would be unsustainable.	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
447	Marion	Malcher	General	Mitigation measures are inadequate- e.g. SANG and SAMM as these already exist. CS7 will require prior assessment by developers to provide information on species and features. The legitimacy of this is	None stated.	The provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) is an established and agreed mitigation measure (agreed by Natural England) to address the impact of residential development on the Special Protection Area (SPA).  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				challenged.		<p>Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
447	Marion	Malcher	General	<p>Object to proposals on the impact it would have to Woking's Roads.</p> <p>The Strategic Transport Assessment shows that there would be an inevitable increase in traffic and the "level of service" for road users would reduce to the lowest category F. Where the majority of roads in Pyrford, West Byfleet and Old Woking are already category F.</p> <p>The traffic will have a negative effect on residents and the congestion alone would clearly demonstrate that plans are untenable.</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 comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 regarding the impact on health and wellbeing as a result of 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 to resident's amenity 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. 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
447	Marion	Malcher	General	<p>Not satisfied with the procedures undertaken to prepare the DPD.</p> <p>Documents are inaccessible on the website. There is no clear audit trail, the status of documents (i.e. current or superseded) is unclear and the naming of locations is</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. The Council is satisfied that it has complied with the prescribed procedures set out in the regulations.</p> <p>The Council is confident of its evidence base (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0) and is not aware that any of these being undated or where the status</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				inconsistent. The DPD should have been prepared taking into account all representations that were received.		is unclear.  The Council endeavours to keep the site names consistent, however due to the numerous assessments undertaken on the sites, site name and references may differ from the various documents. It is appreciated that the naming of locations may not reflect 'well known place names'- however it is considered important that the references are clear and concise, which the Council is satisfied that they are.  Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. In addition, Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015, responses were provided at the meeting and these were minuted.	
447	Marion	Malcher	General	CS7 states that new development can promote biodiversity with sensitive design and landscaping. This is incorrect building development can only mitigate against habitat and biodiversity loss. This error needs to be recognised in the SA-objective 9- to conserve and enhance biodiversity	None stated.	The Council is confident that sites in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) have been consistently assessed against SA objective 9.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
946	Andrew	Malcher	General	Outlines NPPF paragraphs 44, questions why the Council are using public money to destroy Green Belt when it is specifically protected. Objects to the principle of Green Belt development. Green Belt prevents urban areas from being over developed and merging into one another, counters pollution and provides a relaxing environment. The Green Belt should be preserved for future generations.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 10.0, 20.0 and 24.0  The Council welcomes representations on the proposed DPD and has comprehensively addressed this in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.		
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB12	Outlines NPPF paragraphs 44, questions why the Council are using public money to destroy Green Belt when it is specifically protected. Objects to the principle of Green Belt development. Green Belt prevents urban areas from being over developed and merging into one another, counters pollution and provides a relaxing environment. The Green Belt should be preserved for future generations.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 10.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council welcomes representations on the proposed DPD and has comprehensively addressed this in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 6.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB13	Outlines NPPF paragraphs 44, questions why the Council are using public money to destroy Green Belt when it is specifically protected. Objects to the principle of Green Belt development. Green Belt prevents urban areas from being over developed and merging into one another, counters pollution and provides a relaxing environment. The Green Belt should be preserved for future generations.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 10.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council welcomes representations on the proposed DPD and has comprehensively addressed this in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 6.0</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
					neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.		
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB12	Objects to the removal of Green Belt in Pyrford. WBC research shows current proposed development will lead to gridlock. This does not consider Wiseley Airfield, Broadoaks School proposal or BG12 ad GB13. The road network will be at capacity and development will make the situation worse. There is no space for soft mitigation measures. Hard mitigation improvements will detract from the character of the area and just move the problem along the network, as seen at the A3 at Guildford.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.	<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, taking into account development proposals within and outside of the Borough. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>As set out above, the exact nature of traffic mitigation measures will be considered at the Development Management stage of the process. At present, the Site Allocations DPD highlights that the proposed site is suitable for residential development based on the available strategic evidence. A full list of this evidence is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB13	Objects to the removal of Green Belt in Pyrford. WBC research shows current proposed development will lead to gridlock. This does not consider Wiseley Airfield, Broadoaks School proposal or BG12 ad GB13. The road network will be at capacity and development will make the situation worse. There is no space for soft mitigation measures. Hard mitigation improvements will detract from the character of the area and just move the problem along the network, as seen at the A3 at Guildford.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.	<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, taking into account development proposals within and outside of the Borough. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>As set out above, the exact nature of traffic mitigation measures will be considered at the Development Management stage of the process. At present, the Site Allocations DPD highlights that the proposed site is suitable for residential development based on the available strategic evidence. A full list of this evidence is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
946	Andrew	Malcher	General	Outlines NPPF paragraphs 14, 45 and 83, states there is no requirement to destroy Green Belt to satisfy housing needs.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.		
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB12	Outlines NPPF paragraphs 14, 45 and 83, states there is no requirement to destroy Green Belt to satisfy housing needs.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.	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
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB13	Outlines NPPF paragraphs 14, 45 and 83, states there is no requirement to destroy Green Belt to satisfy housing needs.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.		
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB12	Supports development to provide affordable housing for younger generation, but WTC developments have not resulted in real affordable units. Developers do not willingly build affordable housing or housing suitable for downsizers.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed	There are robust Development Plan policies that address these matters, including Core Strategy Policy CS12 which requires the provision of affordable housing on qualifying sites and CS11 which requires the provision of a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment.  The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					before any more development is contemplated.		
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB13	Supports development to provide affordable housing for younger generation, but WTC developments have not resulted in real affordable units. Developers do not willingly build affordable housing or housing suitable for downsizers.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.	There are robust Development Plan policies that address these matters, including Core Strategy Policy CS12 which requires the provision of affordable housing on qualifying sites and CS11 which requires the provision of a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment.  The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB12	Objects to development proposals on countryside.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular 1.9.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.		
946	Andrew	Malcher	GB13	Objects to development proposals on countryside.	There is no point in minor tinkering with the plan as published. I urge you to listen to what the local residents actually want you to do. Any development should be co-ordinated with similar plans in neighbouring boroughs. Your existing traffic projections indicate that traffic flow will continue to build up to the point of complete gridlock. You need to explain how infrastructure limitations will be addressed before any more development is contemplated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular 1.9.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
14	Jo	Male	GB9	The site's landowner Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd. strongly supports the identification of site GB9 for removal from the Green Belt to meet the long term development needs of the Borough.	None.	Support 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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB7	Object to increasing the number of pitches on the site. Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape 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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	Other than a Post Office, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be dependent on a car, which is in conflict with national environmental policies.	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	Other than a Post Office, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be dependent on a car, which is in conflict with national environmental policies.	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	Other than a Post Office, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be dependent on a car, which is in conflict with national environmental policies.	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	Other than a Post Office, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be dependent on a car, which is in conflict with national environmental policies.	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	Other than a Post Office, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be dependent on a car, which is in conflict with national environmental policies.	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	Please 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</p>	No further modification is 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>assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality and noise pollution without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.</p>	
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	Please 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes 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>public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality and noise pollution without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.</p>	
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	Please 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality and noise pollution without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	Please 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality and noise pollution without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.</p>	
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesdon Station but there are no pavements.	Please 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 Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pavements to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
						<p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality and noise pollution without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.</p>	
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected SSSI Heaths due to proximity of development. The open space provides habitats, commuting routes for fauna and surface water drainage for a village very affect by drainage problems. Tree cover provides visual amenity and habitat.	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 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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected SSSI Heaths due to proximity of development. The open space provides habitats, commuting routes for fauna and surface water drainage for a village very affect by drainage problems. Tree cover provides visual amenity and habitat.	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 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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected SSSI Heaths due to proximity of development. The open space provides habitats, commuting routes for fauna and surface water drainage for a village very affect by drainage problems. Tree cover provides visual amenity and habitat.	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 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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>	
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected SSSI Heaths due to proximity of development. The open space provides habitats, commuting routes for fauna and surface water drainage for a village very affect by drainage problems. Tree cover provides visual amenity and habitat.	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 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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected SSSI Heaths due to proximity of development. The open space provides habitats, commuting routes for fauna and surface water drainage for a village very affect by drainage problems. Tree cover provides visual amenity and habitat.	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 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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. These areas should be protected to preserve the open character of Mayford.	Please reconsider your plans	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views	Please reconsider your plans	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views	Please reconsider your plans	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views	Please reconsider your plans	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views	Please reconsider your plans	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views	Please reconsider your plans	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	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. Continuing with the development will dissatisfy thousands of residents of Mayford and nearby areas.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council believes that identifying sites for meet local housing need can be achieved in a manner that protects the existing character of the Borough and its various settlements and landscapes. By identifying key requirements for the sites in the DPD as well as being underpinned by a robust policy framework, the Council are of the opinion that character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	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. Continuing with the development will dissatisfy thousands of residents of Mayford and nearby areas.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council believes that identifying sites for meet local housing need can be achieved in a manner that protects the existing character of the Borough and its various settlements and landscapes. By identifying key requirements for the sites in the DPD as well as being underpinned by a robust policy framework, the Council are of the opinion that character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	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. Continuing with the development will dissatisfy thousands of residents of Mayford and nearby areas.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council believes that identifying sites for meet local housing need can be achieved in a manner that protects the existing character of the Borough and its various settlements and landscapes. By identifying key requirements for the sites in the DPD as well as being underpinned by a robust policy framework, the Council are of the opinion that character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	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. Continuing with the development will dissatisfy thousands of residents of Mayford and nearby areas.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council believes that identifying sites for meet local housing need can be achieved in a manner that protects the existing character of the Borough and its various settlements and landscapes. By identifying key requirements for the sites in the DPD as well as being underpinned by a robust policy framework, the Council are of the opinion that character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Continuing with the development will dissatisfy thousands of residents of Mayford and nearby areas.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council believes that identifying sites for meet local housing need can be achieved in a manner that protects the existing character of the Borough and its various settlements and landscapes. By identifying key requirements for the sites in the DPD as well as being underpinned by a robust policy framework, the Council are of the opinion that character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	The GBBR proposes boundary changes without a LCA which is irregular and lacks due consideration of the needs of the area.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	The GBBR proposes boundary changes without a LCA which is irregular and lacks due consideration of the needs of the area.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	The GBBR proposes boundary changes without a LCA which is irregular and lacks due consideration of the needs of the area.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	The GBBR proposes boundary changes without a LCA which is irregular and lacks due consideration of the needs of the area.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	The GBBR proposes boundary changes without a LCA which is irregular and lacks due consideration of the needs of the area.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	The are a number of brownfield sites in Woking and these should be exhausted first. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The use of Brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.</p> <p>The issue of the Green Belt providing physical separation between settlements is comprehensively addressed in Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	The are a number of brownfield sites in Woking and these should be exhausted first. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The use of Brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.</p> <p>The issue of the Green Belt providing physical separation between settlements is comprehensively addressed in Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	The are a number of brownfield sites in Woking and these should be exhausted first. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The use of Brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.</p> <p>The issue of the Green Belt providing physical separation between settlements is comprehensively addressed in Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	The are a number of brownfield sites in Woking and these should be exhausted first. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The use of Brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.</p> <p>The issue of the Green Belt providing physical separation between settlements is comprehensively addressed in Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.	
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	The are a number of brownfield sites in Woking and these should be exhausted first. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The use of Brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.</p> <p>The issue of the Green Belt providing physical separation between settlements is comprehensively addressed in Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't shown this.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't shown this.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't shown this.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't shown this.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't shown this.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB8	The ownership status of land is not a justified way to approach developing sites and contravenes national policy and the opinions of residents who the Council are accountable to.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB9	The ownership status of land is not a justified way to approach developing sites and contravenes national policy and the opinions of residents who the Council are accountable to.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB10	The ownership status of land is not a justified way to approach developing sites and contravenes national policy and the opinions of residents who the Council are accountable to.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB11	The ownership status of land is not a justified way to approach developing sites and contravenes national policy and the opinions of residents who the Council are accountable to.	Please reconsider your plans	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
960	Andrew	Malley	GB14	The ownership status of land is not a justified way to approach developing sites and contravenes national policy and the opinions of residents who the Council are accountable to.	Please reconsider your plans	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
38	Miles	Mallinson	GB12	Roads - Do not cope currently, the addition of 423 houses could create 500-1000 extra cars and cause gridlock on roads. Particularly between Pyrford, Ripley and the A3	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 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
38	Miles	Mallinson	GB12	Schools- There will be a huge burden	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
38	Miles	Mallinson	GB12	Object to development in the Green Belt.  It is a quiet area and was one of the reasons they moved here	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. It is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
38	Miles	Mallinson	GB13	Roads- Do not cope currently, the addition of 423 houses could create 500-1000 extra cars and cause gridlock on roads. Particularly between Pyrford, Ripley and the A3	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
38	Miles	Mallinson	GB13	Schools- There will be a huge burden	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
38	Miles	Mallinson	GB13	Object to development in the Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
539	Gerald and Margaret	Mandeville	GB12	It would make more sense to build more accommodation for the elderly to release larger houses for younger people.	Build more housing for the elderly to enable release of larger houses.	Core Strategy Policy CS13 states that the Council will encourage the provision of elderly accommodation in sustainable locations across the Borough. It is recognised that this will help in freeing up family sized housing in the Borough. Nevertheless this alone will not reduce the amount of land or dwellings required to meet the local housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
539	Gerald and Margaret	Mandeville	GB13	It would make more sense to build more accommodation for the elderly to release larger houses for younger people.	Build more housing for the elderly to enable release of larger houses.	Core Strategy Policy CS13 states that the Council will encourage the provision of elderly accommodation in sustainable locations across the Borough. It is recognised that this will help in freeing up family sized housing in the Borough. Nevertheless this alone will not reduce the amount of land or dwellings required to meet the local housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
539	Gerald and Margaret	Mandeville	GB12	Development will worsen congestion on already congested roads, and there is insufficient parking at the medical centre.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 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 in local areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
539	Gerald and Margaret	Mandeville	GB13	Development will worsen congestion on already congested roads, and there is insufficient parking at the medical centre.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 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 in local areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
539	Gerald and Margaret	Mandeville	GB12	Strongly objects to the proposals as does not want to lose the rural aspect of village life.	The green belt should be preserved.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. The proposals can be developed without undermining the character and landscape character of the area. This particular issues is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.	
539	Gerald and Margaret	Mandeville	GB13	Strongly objects to the proposals as does not want to lose the rural aspect of village life.	The green belt should be preserved.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. The proposals can be developed without undermining the character and landscape character of the area. This particular issues is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	General	There is a lack of evidence on how proposals will impact the local area - e.g. lack of traffic assessment. The existing roads are already strained, proposals would exacerbate the problems	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 8.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	General	Inadequate evidence to demonstrate the impact on impact on Byfleet and West Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	GB4	Inadequate evidence to demonstrate the impact on impact on Byfleet and West Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	GB5	Inadequate evidence to demonstrate the impact on impact on Byfleet and West Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	GB15	Inadequate evidence to demonstrate the impact on impact on Byfleet and West Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	GB16	Inadequate evidence to demonstrate the impact on impact on Byfleet and West Byfleet	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	General	Concern regarding the lack of public consultation for the release of GB land. Proposals set a precedent for the future. The consultation process has been rushed, constrained and supported by inadequate evidence base.  Particularly concerned that the vast majority of sites are located in Byfleet/West Byfleet.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 8.0, 6.0, 9.0, 11.0, 17.0  The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. 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). The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity  Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
357	R	Mann	General	Concerned that proposals are based on inadequate evidence base that suggests that the release of the GB is the only viable solution. No other options (e.g. brownfield sites) have been considered	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
212	Jacqueline	Manser	GB12	Pyrford and West Byfleet facilities are stretched to the maximum - traffic and congestion, car parking, schools, doctor's surgery. Development will add to the problems, will bring surface water and foul drainage problems and danger to narrow busy local roads.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
212	Jacqueline	Manser	GB13	Pyrford and West Byfleet facilities are stretched to the maximum - traffic and congestion, car parking, schools, doctor's surgery. Development will add to the problems, will bring surface water and foul drainage problems and danger to narrow busy local roads.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
212	Jacqueline	Manser	GB13	I object to this proposal. Both sites form an important open space barrier between existing Pyrford Woods Estate, Aviary Road and Teggs Lane to Pyrford Common Road. If this proceeds, unable to resist development on open land east of Sandy Lane, setting a new precedent. The fields currently blend with the rural natural surroundings and are an important and rare gradient land rise to the escarpment on Church Hill. The sites are also viewpoints and recreational areas. The Council should be proactive to protect these from development and consider purchasing them at agricultural/amenity value for badly needed recreational land.	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
212	Jacqueline	Manser	GB12	I object to this proposal. Both sites form an important open space barrier between existing Pyrford Woods Estate, Aviary Road and Teggs Lane to Pyrford Common Road. If this	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proceeds, unable to resist development on open land east of Sandy Lane, setting a new precedent. The fields currently blend with the rural natural surroundings and are an important and rare gradient land rise to the escarpment on Church Hill. The sites are also viewpoints and recreational areas. The Council should be proactive to protect these from development and consider purchasing them at agricultural/amenity value for badly needed recreational land.			
212	Jacqueline	Manser	GB12	The Council should look at alternative sites rather than identify isolated sites just to keep numbers up for housing. Brownfield sites have not been identified, I suspect because developers contacting the Council are looking for an easy option. Other more suitable sites in Pyrford ignored; in Pyrford Road and Old Woking Road near Shey Copse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
212	Jacqueline	Manser	GB13	The Council should look at alternative sites rather than identify isolated sites just to keep numbers up for housing. Brownfield sites have not been identified, I suspect because developers contacting the Council are looking for an easy option. Other more suitable sites in Pyrford ignored; in Pyrford Road and Old Woking Road near Shey Copse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
216	Anthony	Manser	GB12	Pyrford and West Byfleet facilities are stretched to the maximum - traffic and congestion, car parking, schools, doctor's surgery. Development will add to the problems, will bring surface water and foul drainage problems and danger to narrow busy local roads.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
216	Anthony	Manser	GB13	Pyrford and West Byfleet facilities are stretched to the maximum - traffic and congestion, car parking, schools, doctor's surgery. Development will add to the problems, will bring surface water and foul drainage problems and danger to narrow busy local roads.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
216	Anthony	Manser	GB12	I object to this proposal. Both sites form an important open space barrier between existing Pyrford Woods Estate, Aviary Road and Teggs Lane to Pyrford Common Road. If this proceeds, unable to resist development on open land east of Sandy Lane, setting a new precedent. The fields currently blend with the rural natural surroundings.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
216	Anthony	Manser	GB13	I formally object. Both sites form an important open space barrier between existing Pyrford Woods Estate, Aviary Road and Teggs Lane to Pyrford Common Road. If this proceeds, unable to resist development on open land east of Sandy Lane, setting a new precedent. The fields currently blend with the rural natural surroundings.	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
216	Anthony	Manser	GB12	The Council should be proactive to protect these from development and consider purchasing them at agricultural/amenity value for badly needed recreational land.	None stated.	The Council will make sure that any development that comes forward is sufficiently supported by open space and green infrastructure. These are clearly set out in the key requirements of the proposals. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
216	Anthony	Manser	GB13	The Council should be proactive to protect these from development and consider purchasing them at agricultural/amenity value for badly needed recreational land.	None stated.	The development of the proposals will be supported by adequate green infrastructure and open space provision. These are clearly set out as key requirements of the proposals. The Council believes that the proposals will help to protect the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						significantly affected.	
216	Anthony	Manser	GB12	The Council should look at alternative sites rather than identify isolated sites just to keep numbers up for housing. Brownfield sites have not been identified, I suspect because developers contacting the Council are looking for an easy option. Other more suitable sites in Pyrford ignored; in Pyrford Road and Old Woking Road near Shey Copse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
216	Anthony	Manser	GB13	The Council should look at alternative sites rather than identify isolated sites just to keep numbers up for housing. Brownfield sites have not been identified, I suspect because developers contacting the Council are looking for an easy option. Other more suitable sites in Pyrford ignored; in Pyrford Road and Old Woking Road near Shey Copse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
216	Anthony	Manser	GB13	The sites are an important and rare gradient land rise to the escarpment on Church Hill. The sites are also viewpoints and recreational areas.	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
216	Anthony	Manser	GB12	They are an important and rare gradient land rise to the escarpment on Church Hill. The sites are also viewpoints and recreational areas.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
219	John	Manser	GB12	Pyrford and West Byfleet facilities are stretched to the maximum - traffic and congestion, car parking, schools, doctor's surgery. Development will add to the problems, will bring surface water and foul drainage problems and danger to narrow busy local roads.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
219	John	Manser	GB13	Pyrford and West Byfleet facilities are stretched to the maximum - traffic and congestion, car parking, schools, doctor's surgery. Development will add to the problems, will bring surface water and foul drainage problems and danger to narrow busy local roads.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
219	John	Manser	GB12	I formally object. Both sites form an important open space barrier between existing Pyrford Woods Estate, Aviary Road and Teggs Lane to Pyrford Common Road. If this proceeds, unable to resist development on open land east of Sandy Lane, setting a new precedent. The fields currently blend with the rural natural surroundings.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
219	John	Manser	GB13	I formally object. Both sites form an important open space barrier between existing Pyrford Woods Estate, Aviary Road and Teggs Lane to Pyrford Common Road. If this proceeds, unable to resist development on open land east of Sandy Lane, setting a new precedent. The fields currently blend with the rural natural surroundings.	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
219	John	Manser	GB12	The Council should be proactive to protect these from development and consider purchasing them at agricultural/amenity value for badly needed recreational land.	None stated.	The Council will make sure that any development that comes forward is sufficiently supported by open space and green infrastructure. These are clearly set out in the key requirements of the proposals. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
219	John	Manser	GB13	The Council should be proactive to protect these from development and consider purchasing them at agricultural/amenity value for badly needed recreational land.	None stated.	The development of the proposals will be supported by adequate green infrastructure and open space provision. These are clearly set out as key requirements of the proposals. The Council believes that the proposals will help to protect the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
219	John	Manser	GB12	The Council should look at alternative sites rather than identify isolated sites just to keep numbers up for housing. Brownfield sites have not been identified, I suspect because developers contacting the Council are looking for an easy option. Other more suitable sites in Pyrford ignored; in Pyrford Road and Old Woking Road near Shey Copse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
219	John	Manser	GB13	The Council should look at alternative sites rather than identify isolated sites just to keep numbers up for housing. Brownfield sites have not been identified, I suspect because developers contacting the Council are looking for an easy option. Other more suitable sites in Pyrford ignored; in Pyrford Road and Old Woking Road near Shey Copse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
219	John	Manser	GB13	The sites are an important and rare gradient land rise to the escarpment on Church Hill. The sites are also viewpoints and recreational areas.	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
219	John	Manser	GB12	The sites are an important and rare gradient land rise to the escarpment on Church Hill. The sites are also viewpoints and recreational areas.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
650	Carole	March	GB15	Opposes the plan, as it would remove almost all of the very little natural green space left in West Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
650	Carole	March	GB16	Opposes the plan, as it would remove almost all of the very little natural green space left in West Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
650	Carole	March	GB15	Opposes the proposal. Over the last 30 years there has been a detrimental effect of increasing congestion in the village.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; 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	No further modification is 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>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>	
650	Carole	March	GB16	Opposes the proposal. Over the last 30 years there has been a detrimental effect of increasing congestion in the village.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; 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
650	Carole	March	GB15	The proposed housing (around 750 homes) and potentially a new school for up to 900 pupils would cause unacceptable congestion on already very busy roads, at peak hours.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
650	Carole	March	GB16	The proposed housing (around 750 homes) and potentially a new school for up to 900 pupils would cause unacceptable congestion on already very busy roads, at peak hours.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
650	Carole	March	GB15	The proposals would place additional strain on overstretched infrastructure, particularly the health centre and school, which are already at capacity.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of infrastructure and school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and for school places, paragraph 3.8. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
650	Carole	March	GB16	The proposals would place additional strain on overstretched infrastructure, particularly the health centre and school, which are already at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of infrastructure and school places in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and for school places, paragraph 3.8. In terms of health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
650	Carole	March	GB15	WBC have not given adequate reasons to justify the release of these sites from Green Belt. There must be more appropriate sites in the Borough where a smaller proportion of local green space could be taken, and where impact on local infrastructure (roads, health and education) would be less severely felt.	Preserve the small amount of Green Belt left in West Byfleet	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. This is detailed further in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0. In releasing Green Belt land for housing, 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. In addition the issues highlighted are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 (assessment of alternative sites) and 3.0 (infrastructure provision).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
650	Carole	March	GB16	WBC have not given adequate reasons to justify the release of these sites from Green Belt. There must be more appropriate sites in the Borough where a smaller proportion of local green space could be taken, and where impact on local infrastructure (roads, health and education) would be less severely felt.	Preserve the small amount of Green Belt left in West Byfleet	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. This is detailed further in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0. In releasing Green Belt land for housing, 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. In addition the issues highlighted are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 (assessment of alternative sites) and 3.0 (infrastructure provision).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1462	John	Marchant	General	The general public are not fully aware of the significance of the proposals. They have not been publicised enough.	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
1462	John	Marchant	GB15	The general public are not fully aware of the significance of the proposals. They have not been publicised enough.	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
1462	John	Marchant	GB16	The general public are not fully aware of the significance of the proposals. They have not been publicised enough.	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
1462	John	Marchant	GB4	The general public are not fully aware of the significance of the proposals. They have not been publicised enough.	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
1462	John	Marchant	GB5	The general public are not fully aware of the significance of the proposals. They have not been publicised enough.	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
1462	John	Marchant	General	Objects to the expensive study undertaken to choose Green Belt land and no expensive study to find brownfield sites first.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1462	John	Marchant	General	There is insufficient infrastructure along Parvis Road to take and increase in traffic, and asks how the additional pressure on already overstretched doctors surgeries will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	
1462	John	Marchant	GB15	There is insufficient infrastructure along Parvis Road to take and increase in traffic, and asks how the additional pressure on already overstretched doctors surgeries will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1462	John	Marchant	GB16	There is insufficient infrastructure along Parvis Road to take and increase in traffic, and asks how the additional pressure on already overstretched doctors surgeries will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1462	John	Marchant	GB4	There is insufficient infrastructure along Parvis Road to take and increase in traffic, and asks how the additional pressure on already overstretched doctors surgeries will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1462	John	Marchant	GB5	There is insufficient infrastructure along Parvis Road to take and increase in traffic, and asks how the additional pressure on already overstretched doctors surgeries will be addressed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Core Strategy Policy CS16: Infrastructure Delivery outlines the Council's approach with regard to the timing of infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1462	John	Marchant	GB4	Asks how pouring more concrete into 'virgin soil' will add to local flooding, and whether this has been considered.	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
1462	John	Marchant	GB5	Asks how pouring more concrete into 'virgin soil' will add to local flooding, and whether this has been considered.	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
1462	John	Marchant	GB15	Asks how pouring more concrete into 'virgin soil' will add to local flooding, and whether this has been considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1462	John	Marchant	GB16	Asks how pouring more concrete into 'virgin soil' will add to local flooding, and whether this has been considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
487	J	Markey	GB12	Amazed at the proposal to build four hundred new homes in Pyrford. There has already been significant change, detracting from the beauty and greenness of the village, and causing traffic, pollution and loss of trees.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>the Core Strategy. 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>	
487	J	Markey	GB13	Amazed at the proposal to build four hundred new homes in Pyrford. There has already been significant change, detracting from the beauty and greenness of the village, and causing traffic, pollution and loss of trees.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</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
487	J	Markey	GB12	Puts forward a view of Woking and surrounding villages being granted city status, demolishing houses and trees and building a motorway, flyover and developing like London, and forgetting about this green and pleasant land!	None stated.	<p>The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town or city. 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.</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
487	J	Markey	GB13	Puts forward a view of Woking and surrounding villages being granted city status, demolishing houses and trees and building a motorway, flyover and developing like London, and forgetting about this green and pleasant land!	None stated.	<p>The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town or city. 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.</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
487	J	Markey	GB12	Doctors and health services are already full, and there is a lack of clarity about current provision.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
487	J	Markey	GB13	Doctors and health services are already full, and there is a lack of clarity about current provision.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
487	J	Markey	GB12	The Old Woking Road is the only road serving Guildford, Ripley, Woking, Weybridge, Cobham, Chobham, Knaphill, including roads leading to the A3 and M25, and is a single line road in both directions. Provides details of numerous developments in the immediate and surrounding area, and	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				outlines the substantially increased volume of traffic and congestion, particularly at rush hour, that this has caused.			
487	J	Markey	GB13	The Old Woking Road is the only road serving Guildford, Ripley, Woking, Weybridge, Cobham, Chobham, Knaphill, including roads leading to the A3 and M25, and is a single line road in both directions. Provides details of numerous developments in the immediate and surrounding area, and outlines the substantially increased volume of traffic and congestion, particularly at rush hour, that this has caused.	None stated.	This representation 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
487	J	Markey	GB12	Despite the trains from Woking being fast and frequent, is a nightmare getting a seat.	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
487	J	Markey	GB13	Despite the trains from Woking being fast and frequent, is a nightmare getting a seat.	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
1561	P.M.	Marshall	General	Support the Green Belt proposals between Chobham Road in Knaphill and the borough boundary with Surrey Heath. The land is a wildlife haven. There is also a possible escarpment opposite the houses on Swallow Rise. It should be designated as an escarpment to protect it from future development and Green Belt policy alone is not enough. This is evident from the lack of enforcement of Conditions on a number of sites in the area. Evidence of a letter highlighting the rich wildlife and biodiversity within the area.	Designation of an Escarpment in Knaphill in order to further protect it from development.	Support noted.  The Site Allocations DPD can not add or remove a designation such as an Escarpment or Rising Ground of Landscape Importance without a full or partial review of the Core Strategy, in particular Core Strategy Policy CS24. At this stage the Council is not proposing to review the Core Strategy and therefore unable to designate any new escarpments or publish them out on the Proposals Map.  In addition, the area noted is within the Green Belt and protected by both the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CS6.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
101	William	Martin	GB12	My Wife's relatives came to Pyrford in 1696, so the Family has been here for some time. I came here in 1952 when Pyrford Woods were filled with trees not houses and it was a lovely village. Now it is getting a lot bigger and I think that it is enough. The traffic around here is very bad at peak times and with development of Broadoaks, Parvis Road will be brought to a stand still.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. To inform the allocations, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the general character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is also working its neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the impacts of development in their area such as Wisley Airfield that has cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
101	William	Martin	GB12	I hope that you rethink the development of the two fields either side of Upshot Lane and the redevelopment of Pyrford School. Roads are already nearly impossible to travel on school days and will be ten times worse if those two fields are filled with houses. I am sure that councillors who do not live here could care less and the so called village cannot be called that any more as it will be spoiled for ever. It seems politicians are the cause of the need for more houses and immigration should be stopped for some time or there will be no green fields for farmers to grow crops for this country or for export and we will have more floods by covering the	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				green fields with houses and concrete. WHAT A PROSPECT? It will be like CAPRI where they have no green fields and cannot build another house anywhere; is that what we want to leave the people who come behind us????		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.	
101	William	Martin	GB13	My Wife's relatives came to Pyrford in 1696, so the Family has been here for some time. I came here in 1952 when Pyrford Woods were filled with trees not houses and it was a lovely village. Now it is getting a lot bigger and I think that it is enough. The traffic around here is very bad at peak times and with development of Broadoaks, Parvis Road will be brought to a stand still.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. To inform the allocations, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the general character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is also working its neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the impacts of development in their area such as Wisley Airfield that has cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
101	William	Martin	GB13	I hope that you rethink the development of the two fields either side of Upshot Lane and the redevelopment of Pyrford School. Roads are already nearly impossible to travel on school days and will be ten times worse if those two fields are filled with houses. I am sure that councillors who do not live here could care less and the so called village cannot be called that any more as it will be spoiled for ever. It seems politicians are the cause of the need for more houses and immigration should be stopped for some time or there will be no green fields for farmers to grow crops for this country or for export and we will have more floods by covering the green fields with houses and concrete. WHAT A PROSPECT? It will be like CAPRI where they have no green fields and cannot build another house anywhere; is that what we want to leave the people who come behind us????	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
188	Susan	Martin	GB16	I object to removal of land from the Green Belt in the Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet. The worst is possibility of building on the fields at Upshott Lane. This will spoil Pyrford's setting and encroach on countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council 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
188	Susan	Martin	GB15	I object to removal of land from the Green Belt in the Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet. The worst is possibility of building on the fields at Upshott Lane. This will spoil Pyrford's setting and encroach on countryside.	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
188	Susan	Martin	GB23	I object to removal of land from the Green Belt in the Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet. The worst is possibility of building on the fields at Upshott Lane. This will spoil Pyrford's setting and encroach on countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
188	Susan	Martin	GB4	I object to removal of land from the Green Belt in the Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet. The worst is possibility of building on the fields at Upshott Lane. This will spoil Pyrford's setting and encroach on countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
188	Susan	Martin	GB5	I object to removal of land from the Green Belt in the Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet. The worst is possibility of building on the fields at Upshott Lane. This will spoil Pyrford's setting and encroach on countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
188	Susan	Martin	GB13	I object to removal of land from the Green Belt in the Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet. The worst is possibility of building on the fields at Upshott Lane. This will spoil Pyrford's setting and encroach on countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
188	Susan	Martin	GB12	I object to removal of land from the Green Belt in the Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet. The worst is possibility of building on the fields at Upshott Lane. This will spoil Pyrford's setting and encroach on countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village. The council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposals will ensure that the development of the sites addresses archaeological issues on the site in accordance with Policy Cs20 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	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, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	Based on the available evidence it is not expected that the proposal will affect the most versatile agricultural land in the area. The Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape of the sites to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence as explained in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. The proposals will not adversely impact on designated open spaces.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpmnts)	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
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	The Council recognises the impact of traffic on pollution and has ensured that the traffic impacts of the proposals are fully assessed. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policies to make sure the development impacts on pollution are appropriately controlled.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
251	Eric	Mason	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. 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.	
251	Eric	Mason	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will be compromised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	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 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
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						to the 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	
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	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
252	Valerie	Mason	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
252	Valerie	Mason	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
752	Mark	Mason	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB7	Object to proposal. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
752	Mark	Mason	GB8	Worplesdon Station is struggling with the number of passengers using it. The single lane road tunnel on Prey heath will become a bottle neck, the car park is full and the trains are at capacity with people standing.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB9	Worplesdon Station is struggling with the number of passengers using it. The single lane road tunnel on Prey heath will become a bottle neck, the car park is full and the trains are at capacity with people standing.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB10	Worplesdon Station is struggling with the number of passengers using it. The single lane road tunnel on Prey heath will become a bottle neck, the car park is full and the trains are at capacity with people standing.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB11	Worplesdon Station is struggling with the number of passengers using it. The single lane road tunnel on Prey heath will become a bottle neck, the car park is full and the trains are at capacity with people standing.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>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</p>	No further modification is 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>railway stations.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	
752	Mark	Mason	GB8	Strongly object to housing on the site. National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking , against the purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB9	Strongly object to housing on the site. National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking , against the purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB10	Strongly object to housing on the site. National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking , against the purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB11	Strongly object to housing on the site. National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking , against the purpose of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB8	Mayford does not have the local amenities to support an increase in population	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
752	Mark	Mason	GB9	Mayford does not have the local amenities to support an increase in population	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
752	Mark	Mason	GB10	Mayford does not have the local amenities to support an increase in population	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
752	Mark	Mason	GB11	Mayford does not have the local amenities to support an increase in population	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
752	Mark	Mason	General	<p>Saunders Lane has a quiet, semi-rural village feel surrounded by Green Belt. The plans would eradicate all the attributes of Mayford that appealed to us.</p> <p>The plans would change the intrinsic characteristics of the community, which makes Mayford such a pleasure. Struggle to believe there are no better alternatives that won't have such consequences on a small, but close knit group of people. As such I strongly object to the proposals.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>The Council has considered the impact of the proposed allocations along with an assessment of alternative sites in the Borough. This is set out within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as well as addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	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. The Green Belt offers a great environment for those that live near it.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and</p>	No further modification is 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>nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	
752	Mark	Mason	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. The Green Belt offers a great environment for those that live near it.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been</p>	No further modification is 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 the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
752	Mark	Mason	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. The Green Belt offers a great environment for those that live near it.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	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. The Green Belt offers a great environment for those that live near it.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is 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>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> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	
752	Mark	Mason	General	<p>Please reconsider the plans and put a small community's happiness above financial, ease and other negligible reasons. Removing Mayford's Green Belt is not the only solutions or the best. The plans will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village for current and future generations. It will no longer be an idyllic place to raise a family.</p> <p>Government has advised Councils to protect Green Belt. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	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 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
752	Mark	Mason	GB8	The plans will have a severe impact on infrastructure. There are two single lane bridges that are already congested and will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Travelling into Woking is difficult due to the 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 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
752	Mark	Mason	GB9	The plans will have a severe impact on infrastructure. There are two single lane bridges that are already congested and will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Travelling into Woking is difficult due to the 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</p>	No further modification is 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>	
752	Mark	Mason	GB10	The plans will have a severe impact on infrastructure. There are two single lane bridges that are already congested and will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Travelling into Woking is difficult due to the 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 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
752	Mark	Mason	GB11	The plans will have a severe impact on infrastructure. There are two single lane bridges that are already congested and will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Travelling into Woking is difficult due to the 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 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
296	Lesley	Masters	GB12	The local infrastructure (e.g. doctors, care for the elderly ) is currently strained. Additional growth will exacerbate the problems	None stated.	<p>Most of this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision in the Borough. This however does take into account local circumstances where there may be longer waiting times for appointments than the Borough average. The IDP notes that additional GPs will be required over the Plan period and the Council will continue to work with the local Clinical Commissioning Groups to determine local need and healthcare provision as development comes forward.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
296	Lesley	Masters	GB13	The local infrastructure (e.g. doctors, care for the elderly ) is currently strained. Additional growth will exacerbate the problems	None stated.	<p>Most of this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision in the Borough. This however does take into account local circumstances where there may be longer waiting times for appointments than the Borough average. The IDP notes that additional GPs will be required over the Plan period and the Council will continue to work with the local Clinical Commissioning Groups to determine local need and healthcare provision as development comes forward.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
296	Lesley	Masters	GB12	Ensure alternative solutions have been considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings	Ensure alternative solutions have been considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
296	Lesley	Masters	GB13	Ensure alternative solutions have been considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings	Ensure alternative solutions have been considered first e.g. Brownfield, empty office buildings	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
296	Lesley	Masters	GB13	Proposals will have an impact on the existing character and community of Pyrford	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0</p> <p>In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
296	Lesley	Masters	GB12	Proposals will have an impact on the existing character and community of Pyrford	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 acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
296	Lesley	Masters	GB12	Proposals will exacerbate traffic problems in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
296	Lesley	Masters	GB13	Proposals will exacerbate traffic problems in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford	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
296	Lesley	Masters	GB12	Need to ensure the historic value of Pyrford is preserved.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
296	Lesley	Masters	GB13	Need to ensure the historic value of Pyrford is preserved.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in 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
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB4	Objects to development as there are not enough doctors, dentists, etc. for new residents - are there plans to build a new on as part of the development? This will all lead to an increase in traffic	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB15	Objects to development as there are not enough doctors, dentists, etc. for new residents - are there plans to build a new on as part of the development? This will all lead to an increase in traffic	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
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB16	Objects to development as there are not enough doctors, dentists, etc. for new residents - are there plans to build a new on as part of the development? This will all lead to an increase in traffic	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
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB4	Alternative is to build a self-contained mini-village on the site and not just lots of houses	Create a self-contained mini-village rather than just houses	The proposed allocated site is adjacent to the existing urban area and in close proximity to Byfleet Local Centre. The local area contains a range of services including schools, shops and community facilities. Therefore in this instance it is not necessary to create a mini-village as proposed. Nevertheless there may be the opportunity for new development to provide community facilities which could benefit the existing and future community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB15	Alternative is to build a self-contained mini-village on the site and not just lots of houses	Create a self-contained mini-village rather than just houses	The proposed allocated site is adjacent to the existing urban area and in close proximity to West Byfleet District Centre. The local area contains a range of services including schools, shops, healthcare and community facilities. Therefore in this instance it is not necessary to create a mini-village as proposed. Nevertheless there may be the opportunity for new development to provide community facilities which could benefit the existing and future community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB16	Alternative is to build a self-contained mini-village on the site and not just lots of houses	Create a self-contained mini-village rather than just houses	The proposed allocated site is adjacent to the existing urban area and in close proximity to West Byfleet District Centre. The local area contains a range of services including schools, shops, healthcare and community facilities. Therefore in this instance it is not necessary to create a mini-village as proposed. Nevertheless there may be the opportunity for new development to provide community facilities which could benefit the existing and future community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB4	Will more bus services be provided as they are currently being reduced. This will also lead to congestion.	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
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB15	Will more bus services be provided as they are currently being reduced. This will also lead to congestion.	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
655	Sandra	Mathews	GB16	Will more bus services be provided as they are currently being reduced. This will also lead to congestion.	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
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB12	Objects. The road network will be at overcapacity and mitigation improvements will detract from the character of 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.</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
						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.	
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB13	Objects. The road network will be at overcapacity and mitigation improvements will detract from the character of 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.</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>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
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	Policy Context in which the Plan is being prepared	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	Pathways of Impact	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB12	Pyrford has lost enough Green Belt to development already	None stated.	Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB13	Pyrford has lost enough Green Belt to development already	None stated.	Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB12	The road network will be at capacity and mitigation improvements will detract from the character of the area.	Reduction of the quantity of housing (one side of upshot lane or the other) and then appropriate community development such as additional parking, shops or medical centres to support the new (reduced development).	<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. The introduction of access points into the site and other mitigation/improvement works to the highways network are not expected to have a significant negative impact on areas of conservation and heritage assets. The Council is committed to working with the County Highways Authority in making sure that any highways works are suitable and appropriate.</p> <p>The proposed modification is noted. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised. The Council has addressed the proposed infrastructure modification in the 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.</p> <p>The Core Strategy encourages new social and community facilities in the Borough as set out in Policy CS19. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB13	The road network will be at capacity and mitigation improvements will detract from the character of the area.	Reduction of the quantity of housing (one side of upshot lane or the other) and then appropriate community development such as additional parking, shops or medical centres to support the new (reduced development).	<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. The introduction of access points into the site and other mitigation/improvement works to the highways network are not expected to have a significant negative impact on areas of conservation and heritage assets. The Council is committed to working with the County Highways Authority in making sure that any highways works are suitable and appropriate.</p> <p>The proposed modification is noted. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised. The Council has addressed the proposed infrastructure modification in the 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.</p> <p>The Core Strategy encourages new social and community facilities in the Borough as set out in Policy CS19. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development in Pyrford and Guildford Borough will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is 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.	
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development in Pyrford and Guildford Borough will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB12	Understand the need for affordable housing but should not be at the expense of Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
694	Giles	Mathieson McKendry_B	GB13	Understand the need for affordable housing but should not be at the expense of Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB10	Object to proposals to release GB land in Hook Heath GB10, GB11 and GB14 post 2027. There is inadequate road/transport infrastructure. The local roads are severely congested at peak times e.g. Egley Road. A new school and retail park will exacerbate the problem.	None stated.	<p>Whilst, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The Highway capacity was assessed and it was considered that no significant adverse impacts would result to the local highway network subject to conditions being applied.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB11	Object to proposals to release GB land in Hook Heath GB10, GB11 and GB14 post 2027. There is inadequate road/transport infrastructure. The local roads are severely congested at peak times e.g. Egley Road. A new school and retail park will exacerbate the problem.	None stated.	<p>Whilst, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The Highway capacity was assessed and it was considered that no significant adverse impacts would result to the local highway network subject to conditions being applied.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB14	Object to proposals to release GB land in Hook Heath GB10, GB11 and GB14 post 2027. There is inadequate road/transport infrastructure. The local roads are severely congested at peak times e.g. Egley Road. A new school and retail park will exacerbate the problem.	None stated.	<p>Whilst, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The Highway capacity was assessed and it was considered that no significant adverse impacts would result to the local highway network subject to conditions being applied.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB10	The proposals are contrary to the purpose of the GB namely to maintain open spaces between towns/villages	None stated.	<p>The five main purposes Green Belt is set out under paragraph 80 of the NPPF, including 'to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'. The GBBR assesses the 'performance' of parcels in respect to the Green Belt purposes, where the GBBR has informed the draft Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt but as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, an exceptional circumstances case has been established and it is necessary for the release of Green Belt land to address the significant unmet need.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB11	The proposals are contrary to the purpose of the GB namely to maintain open spaces between towns/villages	None stated.	<p>The five main purposes Green Belt is set out under paragraph 80 of the NPPF, including 'to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'. The GBBR assesses the 'performance' of parcels in respect to the Green Belt purposes, where the GBBR has informed the draft Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt but as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, an exceptional circumstances case has been established and it is necessary for the release of Green Belt land to address the significant unmet need.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB14	The proposals are contrary to the purpose of the GB namely to maintain open spaces between towns/villages	None stated.	<p>The five main purposes Green Belt is set out under paragraph 80 of the NPPF, including 'to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'. The GBBR assesses the 'performance' of parcels in respect to the Green Belt purposes, where the GBBR has informed the draft Site Allocation DPD.</p> <p>The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt but as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, an exceptional circumstances case has been established and it is necessary for the release of Green Belt land to address the significant unmet need.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper 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
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB10	Object to proposals to release GB land in Hook Heath. Appreciates the need for land to meet government housing targets.	None stated.	The objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB11	Object to proposals to release GB land in Hook Heath. Appreciates the need for land to meet government housing targets.	None stated.	The objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB14	Object to proposals to release GB land in Hook Heath. Appreciates the need for land to meet government housing targets.	None stated.	The objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB10	The GB in Surrey is important to its character, redevelopment would destroy the fabric of the area. Protection of the GB should be a national priority. Everyone has the right to live in a clean and healthy environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9, Section 7.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB11	The GB in Surrey is important to its character, redevelopment would destroy the fabric of the area. Protection of the GB should be a national priority. Everyone has the right to live in a clean and healthy environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9, Section 7.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB14	The GB in Surrey is important to its character, redevelopment would destroy the fabric of the area. Protection of the GB should be a national priority. Everyone has the right to live in a clean and healthy environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9, Section 7.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB10	The density of the proposals will change the character of the area forever	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB11	The density of the proposals will change the character of the area forever	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB14	The density of the proposals will change the character of the area forever	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB10	The local schools are over capacity. Proposals would have a extreme impact on schools in the area. A new retail park is unnecessary, brownfield sites are better suited	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB11	The local schools are over capacity. Proposals would have a extreme impact on schools in the area. A new retail park is unnecessary, brownfield sites are better suited	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB14	The local schools are over capacity. Proposals would have a extreme impact on schools in the area. A new retail park is unnecessary, brownfield sites are better suited	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB10	The infrastructure required is not in place and needs to be in place in advance (doctors, dentists, schools).  Since all councils are facing constant cuts in budgets were and how are these to be financed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.  Infrastructure costs are substantial and CIL and S106 are elements of potential funding, however there are a variety of sources of funding that exist.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB11	The infrastructure required is not in place and needs to be in place in advance (doctors, dentists, schools).  Since all councils are facing constant cuts in budgets were and how are these to be financed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.  Infrastructure costs are substantial and CIL and S106 are elements of potential funding, however there are a variety of sources of funding that exist.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
398	V	Matoorian-Pour	GB14	The infrastructure required is not in place and needs to be in place in advance (doctors, dentists, schools).  Since all councils are facing constant cuts in budgets were and how are these to be financed.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.  Infrastructure costs are substantial and CIL and S106 are elements of potential funding, however there are a variety of sources of funding that exist.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
729	Raymond	Matthews	General	Not against new housing in the area but not on Green Belt land. Especially land that is as beautiful as this which would be lost forever.	None stated.	Support for the principle of house building noted.  The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and the impact of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>proposals on landscape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 7.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
729	Raymond	Matthews	Appendix Air Quality Modelling	The existing vehicle fumes is appalling and has health implications	A New road to the south of the proposed development	<p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on air quality without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention, as Highways Authority, to this proposed modification. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
729	Raymond	Matthews	Sustainability Appraisal Process	Objects. The proposal is not sustainable without a new road being built.	A new road would need to be built	<p>Objection noted. The Council will draw the County Council's attention, as Highways Authority, to this proposed modification. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
729	Raymond	Matthews	GB16	The site is unsuitable due to the volume of traffic on A245. The road is too narrow to allow flowing traffic.	A New road to be built to the south of the site to link up with the A3	<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</p>	No further modification is 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>continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council note the suggestion for a new road to be built. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation as the highways authority for the area.</p>	
979	T	Matthews	GB12	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford.</p> <p>Object to developing on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Will negatively affect Pyrford's rural character.</p> <p>The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.</p> <p>The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.</p>	None stated.	<p>The principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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 water and sewage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Council is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that infrastructure provision keeps up with demand.</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
979	T	Matthews	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford.</p> <p>Object to developing on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Will negatively affect Pyrford's rural character.</p> <p>The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.</p> <p>The village infrastructure is at capacity and further</p>	None stated.	<p>The principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development will make the situation worse.		<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 water and sewage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Council is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that infrastructure provision keeps up with demand.</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>	
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated as required by the NPPF. Accepts it may be sensible to look ahead past the current Core Strategy the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and WBC has not demonstrated any housing figure need or exceptional circumstances post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated as required by the NPPF. Accepts it may be sensible to look ahead past the current Core Strategy the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and WBC has not demonstrated any housing figure need or exceptional circumstances post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated as required by the NPPF. Accepts it may be sensible to look ahead past the current Core Strategy the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and WBC has not demonstrated any housing figure need or exceptional	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
				circumstances post 2027.			
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	The proposals ignores the requirement of Core Strategy Policy 24.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	The proposals ignores the requirement of Core Strategy Policy 24.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	The proposals ignores the requirement of Core Strategy Policy 24.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	The GBBR didn't consult. Sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	The GBBR didn't consult. Sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	The GBBR didn't consult. Sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	Proposed densities are much higher compared to local densities.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	Proposed densities are much higher compared to local densities.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	Proposed densities are much higher compared to local densities.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	It is not necessary to remove the site from the Green Belt as no change of use is planned. Furthermore it is not an exceptional circumstance, required to be removed from the Green Belt.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	It is not necessary to remove the site from the Green Belt as no change of use is planned. Furthermore it is not an exceptional circumstance, required to be removed from the Green Belt.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	It is not necessary to remove the site from the Green Belt as no change of use is planned. Furthermore it is not an exceptional circumstance, required to be removed from the Green Belt.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	Objects to development in the Green Belt. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl and would join Mayford to Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	Objects to development in the Green Belt. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl and would join Mayford to Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	Objects to development in the Green Belt. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl and would join Mayford to Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB10	Sustainability has been assessed using Google map travel times, which are based outside the rush hour and therefore are optimistic and ignore a daily problem.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB11	Sustainability has been assessed using Google map travel times, which are based outside the rush hour and therefore are optimistic and ignore a daily problem.	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
1058	John Sarah	Mawdsley	GB14	Sustainability has been assessed using Google map travel times, which are based outside the rush hour and therefore are optimistic and ignore a daily problem.	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.	
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	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
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB8	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB9	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB10	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB11	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB14	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB7	Object to the proposal. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not	No further modification is 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>raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning</p>	No further modification is 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>application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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>	
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB7	Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	General	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. It will also impact Hook Heath with increased traffic.	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> <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
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
1599	Rosemary	Maxfield	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.			
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.			
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 and section 9 of the NPPF. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt" as stated by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and alternative sites identified in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet; Land off New Lane, Sutton Green; land to the west of West Hall, W. Byfleet; and land south of High Street, Byfleet) explored.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. This is further detailed in paragraph 4.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	There is a presumption against such development unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt, re-emphasised by the Secretary of State. Therefore even if the Council can not demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9 -1.12 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.  This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development			of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	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
1461	Katherine	May	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.			
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1461	Katherine	May	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB12	Pyrford is a village, people move here not to be part of a town. The Health Centre, schools and roads are already overstretched. They will not cope with the extra use.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB13	Pyrford is a village, people move here not to be part of a town. The Health Centre, schools and roads are already overstretched. They will not cope with the extra use.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB12	There will be an enormous increase in noise from extra use of Teggs Lane and adjacent land, especially if there is a footpath.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution including noise as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD. The general approach to traffic and infrastructure provision are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB13	There will be an enormous increase in noise from extra use of Teggs Lane and adjacent land, especially if there is a footpath.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution including noise as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD. The general approach to traffic and infrastructure provision are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB13	There are more suitable areas for development than changing Pyrford.	None stated.	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB12	There are more suitable areas for development than changing Pyrford.	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
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB12	We object to development on Green Belt land. We back onto Green Belt fields and moved here so not overlooked and little noise, and paid a premium for this. Development would compromise these and devalue our property. This will seriously affect character of the road. Should protect the timeless unspoilt rural feel and outstanding view.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1109	David Karen	Mayhew	GB13	We object to development on Green Belt land. We back onto Green Belt fields and moved here so not overlooked and little noise, and paid a premium for this. Development would compromise these and devalue our property. This will seriously affect character of the road. Should protect the timeless unspoilt rural feel and outstanding view.	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
39	Claire	Maytham	GB12	<p>The proposed amount of housing is significant for a small village and will alter Pyrford negatively</p> <p>The schools are already at full capacity</p> <p>Local roads will not be able to sustain the level of traffic</p> <p>Prefer smaller scale development on appropriate land</p>	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. It is not envisaged that the proposals will significantly undermine the character of the area. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
39	Claire	Maytham	GB13	The proposed amount of housing is significant for a small village and will alter Pyrford negatively	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	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 schools are already at full capacity</p> <p>Local roads will not be able to sustain the level of traffic</p> <p>Prefer smaller scale development on appropriate land</p>		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 infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3 and 20.	of this representation
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB12	The primary school is bursting at the seams and there are no recreational facilities in the village. Will developments have swings, slides, skate parks? (all lacking in the village).	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB13	The primary school is bursting at the seams and there are no recreational facilities in the village. Will developments have swings, slides, skate parks? (all lacking in the village).	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB12	I object. If the population is increasing, logic says more land should be allocated as Green Belt, not less. It is an easy solution to build houses on a field rather than looking at empty or run down houses to do up. There are 610,000 empty dwellings in the UK. I see you are trying to tackle this but you should do this more aggressively rather than remove green spaces.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land, including increased densities to meet the development needs of the area. See Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB13	I object. If the population is increasing, logic says more land should be allocated as Green Belt, not less. It is an easy solution to build houses on a field rather than looking at empty or run down houses to do up. There are 610,000 empty dwellings in the UK. I see you are trying to tackle this but you should do this more aggressively rather than remove green spaces.	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
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB12	People move to Pyrford to be in the countryside surrounded by trees. They accept the lack of facilities to live in a rural, less populated area. I hope you will consider breaking with your current thinking and think of the future and increase Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB13	People move to Pyrford to be in the countryside surrounded by trees. They accept the lack of facilities to live in a rural, less populated area. I hope you will consider breaking with your current thinking and think of the future and increase Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB12	Adding houses to each area requires facilities and services to also be increased. Better to create a new town/village away from the overcrowded south east of England. This proposal will result in major traffic problems. The bus service is inadequate, the railway station too far away, there is no parking at the school and limited parking at the shops.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB13	Adding houses to each area requires facilities and services to also be increased. Better to create a new town/village away from the overcrowded south east of England. This proposal will result in major traffic problems. The bus service is inadequate, the railway station too far away, there is no parking at the school and limited parking at the shops.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. 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
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB12	There are no facilities for the elderly. Will a day centre with luncheon clubs be built?	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 development will make the necessary contribution towards infrastructure delivery to support development. The Council has published a Regulation 123 list of the infrastructure that it wishes to spend CIL contributions on. There is scope to secure additional infrastructure to meet site specific infrastructure needs, and this will be determined on a case by case basis	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						depending of the merits of the proposal. At this stage it will be unreasonable to confirm either way that a luncheon club will be built.	
1115	Charles Marion	McAllister	GB13	There are no facilities for the elderly. Will a day centre with luncheon clubs be built?	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 development will make the necessary contribution towards infrastructure delivery to support development. The Council has published a Regulation 123 list of the infrastructure that it wishes to spend CIL contributions on. There is scope to secure additional infrastructure to meet site specific infrastructure needs, and this will be determined on a case by case basis depending of the merits of the proposal. At this stage it will be unreasonable to confirm either way that a luncheon club will be built.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	Pedestrian access to the site is problematic due to the lack of existing footway and speed of traffic on local roads.	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. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that in any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Pedestrian access to the site is problematic due to the lack of existing footway and speed of traffic on local roads.	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. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that in any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	Parcel 7 is rejected from the SA contrary to the Green Belt Review's recommendation that it could be considered a safeguarded site if other parcels cannot provide sufficient development quantum for the plan period and beyond to 2040.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0 (and 8.0 and 9.0 for further background on evidence base and assessment of alternative sites for the Draft Site Allocations DPD).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Parcel 7 is rejected from the SA contrary to the Green Belt Review's recommendation that it could be considered a safeguarded site if other parcels cannot provide sufficient development quantum for the plan period and beyond to 2040.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0 (and 8.0 and 9.0 for further background on evidence base and assessment of alternative sites for the Draft Site Allocations DPD).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The Council rejected the Green Belt Review's recommendation that sites are released for Green Belt boundary rationalisation or released to buffer identified development sites, stating they are already 'clear and defensible'.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The Council rejected the Green Belt Review's recommendation that sites are released for Green Belt boundary rationalisation or released to buffer identified development sites, stating they are already 'clear and defensible'.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The Green Belt Review 'sieves' out a number of sites based on a combination of Green Belt, environmental and sustainability factors. This includes sites GB12 and GB13, which are then reintroduced, the former (GB12) based on land availability and whether sites have previously been promoted, which is not an identified criteria in the methodology. No reasonable justification is provided for re-introducing these sites, particularly when several alternative sites performed better in terms of Green Belt suitability and/or sustainability credentials, notably Parcels 7,13,2 and 28.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The Green Belt Review 'sieves' out a number of sites based on a combination of Green Belt, environmental and sustainability factors. This includes sites GB12 and GB13, which are then reintroduced, the former (GB12) based on land availability and whether sites have previously been promoted, which is not an identified criteria in the methodology. No reasonable justification is provided for re-introducing these sites, particularly when several alternative sites performed better in terms of Green Belt suitability and/or sustainability credentials, notably Parcels 7,13,2 and	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				28.			
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The SA is a separate and distinct evidence base that assesses all other reasonable alternative sites promoted and identified in the SHLAA and Employment Land Review and Topic Paper. However, the SA does not assess and sites in Parcel 31 of the Green Belt Review, which in the ranking order is more suitable than Parcel 9.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The SA is a separate and distinct evidence base that assesses all other reasonable alternative sites promoted and identified in the SHLAA and Employment Land Review and Topic Paper. However, the SA does not assess and sites in Parcel 31 of the Green Belt Review, which in the ranking order is more suitable than Parcel 9.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The sites identified in the Green Belt Review have not be subject to an equal and consistent assessment, with more refined appraisal of some sites and some sites not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This is not a sound means of determining sites suitable for release.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The sites identified in the Green Belt Review have not be subject to an equal and consistent assessment, with more refined appraisal of some sites and some sites not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This is not a sound means of determining sites suitable for release.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0 and 13.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The sites together with adjoining woodland and fields form a relatively narrow tract of land providing a continuous stretch of uninterrupted countryside between the town and river valley. This countryside is curtailed by man-made, artificial land forms of golf courses. The sites are also important in containing the southern edge of Woking and providing a strong landscape context for Pyrford. The site is also part of a rural landscape that has not been lost or degraded by golf course development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The sites together with adjoining woodland and fields form a relatively narrow tract of land providing a continuous stretch of uninterrupted countryside between the town and river valley. This countryside is curtailed by man-made, artificial land forms of golf courses. The sites are also important in containing the southern edge of Woking and providing a strong landscape context for Pyrford. The site is also part of a rural landscape that has not been lost or degraded by golf course development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Site GB13 was considered in the Green Belt Review as being particularly sensitive due to its open, exposed nature and designation as an 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' in Woking Local Plan and Core Strategy CS24. It was considered unsuitable for residential development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The site has an important role in providing the rural setting to Pyrford Court Registered Park, Garden and Listed Buildings. Development could erode this landscape, particularly accessing the property along Pyrford Common Road and Upshot Lane.	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
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The site has an important role in providing the rural setting to Pyrford Court Registered Park, Garden and Listed Buildings. Development could erode this landscape, particularly accessing the property along Pyrford Common Road and	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
				Upshot Lane.			
477	S	McArthur	GB12	Developing the site would have various transport and access impacts, meaning that key junctions and access points (including B367 and Upshot Lane priority junction, access into GB12 on Upshot Lane) that are already busy with traffic would have design and layout issues. Improvements would be problematic and result in tree clearance, which is undesirable and would have landscape/ heritage impacts, and archaeological impacts at the priority junction.	None stated.	This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Site specific measures would be required to ensure the roads, junctions and roundabouts that are used to access the sites can operate safely. In terms of trees and hedgerows, the Key Requirements of the draft allocation includes retention of trees and tree belts that are mature, protected or of amenity value. This key requirement includes retention of a substantial tree belt on the western boundary of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Developing the site would have various transport and access impacts, meaning that key junctions and access points (including B367 and Upshot Lane priority junction, access into GB12 on Upshot Lane) that are already busy with traffic would have design and layout issues. Improvements would be problematic and result in tree clearance, which is undesirable and would have landscape/ heritage impacts, and archaeological impacts at the priority junction.	None stated.	This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Site specific measures would be required to ensure the roads, junctions and roundabouts that are used to access the sites can operate safely. In terms of trees and hedgerows, the Key Requirements of the draft allocation includes retention of trees and tree belts that are mature, protected or of amenity value. This key requirement includes retention of a substantial tree belt on the western boundary of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The DPD is in part based on the Peter Brett Green Belt Review which is flawed in a number of respects, particularly as the sites are assessed as unsuitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes, with poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. This undermines the case for the sites' subsequent inclusion.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The DPD is in part based on the Peter Brett Green Belt Review which is flawed in a number of respects, particularly as the sites are assessed as unsuitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes, with poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity. This undermines the case for the sites' subsequent inclusion.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	Purpose 4 of the Green Belt 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' is removed from the Green Belt review as it is considered irrelevant to Woking. While it is noted Woking is not a 'historic town' historic assets should still be assessed alongside other important 'local' considerations relevant to the setting of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0 and 19.0. The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is also acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Purpose 4 of the Green Belt 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' is removed from the Green Belt review as it is considered irrelevant to Woking. While it is noted Woking is not a 'historic town' historic assets should still be assessed alongside other important 'local' considerations relevant to the setting of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0 and 19.0. The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is also acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The Council states it is satisfied that the DPD follows recommendations made in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Green Belt Review. However, there are conflicts between the SA and Green Belt Review, including Site GB13 which is included as a safeguarded site based on the SA recommendation despite being consistently being identified as unsuitable for removal from the Green Belt in the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0 (and 8.0 for further background on evidence base for the Draft Site Allocations DPD).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	General	5 There are conflicts that exist between the Core Strategy objectives and SA objectives, as a result of the need to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, whilst identifying sufficient sites to deliver the unmet housing need.	None stated.	The Council does not consider there to be conflict between objectives to protect the purpose of the Green Belt in the Core Strategy and SA objectives, and the identification of sufficient sits to deliver unmet housing need. Justification for the release of the Green Belt is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.1 to 1.14. Section 9 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper also outlines the assessment of reasonable alternative sites through the Sustainability Appraisal process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	General	Raises concern about the robustness and soundness of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as evidence base for the DPD, and states the Council has come to their own decisions on site allocations and suitability rankings. States it only partially	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 8.0, 9.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				relies on the Green Belt Review. -The discounting of sites and conclusions from the Green Belt Review in the SA means it is inconsistent to re-introduce already discounted sites back into the DPD. - The DPD draws on the Green Belt Review and SA at different stages of the assessment process. Stage 2 utilises the Green Belt Review whilst stage 3 uses the SA. This creates an unsound evidence base and inconsistent methodology.			
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The site is bound by mature trees and shrubs that substantially screen the urban edge of Woking. All the trees within the site are covered by a Tree Protection Order.	None stated.	Trees protected by TPO would be retained as a requirement of any development. This is listed in the draft allocation's Key Requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The site is open, sitting on top of the south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley and with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and beyond to the Surrey Hills AONB. Development will have an impact of this site and GB12 and could result in the loss of sensitive landscape features.	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
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The site is open, sitting on top of the south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley and with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and beyond to the Surrey Hills AONB. Development will have an impact of this site and GB12 and could result in the loss of sensitive landscape features.	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
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The countryside contains a number of important heritage assets which development could adversely impact.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The countryside contains a number of important heritage assets which development could adversely impact.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	Development would have an adverse impact on: Pyrford Court Registered Park, Garden and Listed Buildings; Pyrford area and surrounding agricultural landscape and farms including along Warren Lane to the Grade II listed 1480s Wheelers Farm and Barn; the building at Key Lees.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Development would have an adverse impact on: Pyrford Court Registered Park, Garden and Listed Buildings; Pyrford area and surrounding agricultural landscape and farms including along Warren Lane to the Grade II listed 1480s Wheelers Farm and Barn; the building at Key Lees.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Objects to the release of Green Belt land for development for a number of reasons. The first is that the Council has approved the draft Site Allocations DPD without taking into account representations received. The Executive were of the view that the draft Site Allocations DPD was 'based on robust evidence' but does account for the LDA Design letter demonstrating the contrary, that the evidence base is not robust.	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
477	S	McArthur	GB12	Objects to the release of Green Belt land for development for a number of reasons. The first is that the Council has approved the draft Site Allocations DPD without taking into account representations received. The Executive were of the view that the draft Site Allocations DPD was 'based on robust evidence' but does account for the LDA Design letter demonstrating the contrary, that the evidence base is not robust.	None stated.	As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
477	S	McArthur	GB12	Pyrford is the gateway to the Surrey Hills and development would lead to the loss of the character and charm of the village forever.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, 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	No further modification is 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>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.</p>	
477	S	McArthur	GB13	Pyrford is the gateway to the Surrey Hills and development would lead to the loss of the character and charm of the village forever.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, 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.</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
477	S	McArthur	GB12	The site is part of land surrounding Pyrford Conservation Area and analysis shows fields were once farmed by residents of Pyrford. Whilst development would not affect architecture and layout of the village, it could erode its rural setting.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 19.0. In addition, 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.</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
477	S	McArthur	GB13	The site is part of land surrounding Pyrford Conservation Area and analysis shows fields were once farmed by residents of Pyrford. Whilst development would not affect architecture and layout of the village, it could erode its rural setting.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 19.0. In addition, 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.</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
477	S	McArthur	GB12	There is no more infrastructure for the village, and there are already issues as trains into London are full, as are medical practices, schools and roads. The development of the site does not include any major infrastructure which is needed for this amount of new housing.	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, 3.8 and 3.11. With regard to rail services into London, the point made 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. Regarding local medical practices, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
477	S	McArthur	GB13	There is no more infrastructure for the village, and there are already issues as trains into London are full, as are medical practices, schools and roads. The development of the site does not include any major infrastructure which is needed for this amount of new housing.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. With regard to rail services into London, the point made 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. Regarding local medical practices, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB8	The sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF. There is an absence of any very special circumstances set out. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances.	None stated.	The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB9	The sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF. There is an absence of any very special circumstances set out. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances.	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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB10	The sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF. There is an absence of any very special circumstances set out. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances.	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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB11	The sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF. There is an absence of any very special circumstances set out. Unmet demand does not constitute very special circumstances.	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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	Traveller sites should be close to schools and services as set out in the Core Strategy and SHLAA, this site is not.  There is a lack of supporting infrastructure in the area. The development of a communal building for Travellers will not positively enhance the environment and openness of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a through assessment against all reasonable and deliverable alternatives, this site is considered to be suitable for additional Traveller pitches on what is an existing Traveller site.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties</p>	No further modification is 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>such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	<p>The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.</p> <p>Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI and Hoe Stream SNCI and would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites that form the boundary of the land.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	<p>The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse 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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	Every issue noted is a serious matter and together present an overwhelming objection.	None stated.	The Council has addressed the issues noted above. It is of the opinion that there are no fundamental issues that can not be addressed at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB8	Strongly object to building houses on Mayford sites. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB9	Strongly object to building houses on Mayford sites. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB10	Strongly object to building houses on Mayford sites. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB11	Strongly object to building houses on Mayford sites. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	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	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.		
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	<p>The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line.</p> <p>The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the 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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	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 site should not be included in the DPD.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.		As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches. No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the ONLY sites put forward.	The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly decontaminated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
806	Peter	McAtamney	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	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.		
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB8	Brandon Lewis MP clearly set out that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. This is supported by the Secretary of State. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding National Policy on Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford 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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB9	Brandon Lewis MP clearly set out that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. This is supported by the Secretary of State. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding National Policy on Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford 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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB10	Brandon Lewis MP clearly set out that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. This is supported by the Secretary of State. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding National Policy on Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford 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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB11	Brandon Lewis MP clearly set out that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. This is supported by the Secretary of State. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding National Policy on Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9.</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford 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
806	Peter	McAtamney	GB7	The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21:</p>	No further modification is 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>Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	
806	Peter	McAtamney	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 and in Guildford Borough will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</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
806	Peter	McAtamney	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 and in Guildford Borough will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</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
806	Peter	McAtamney	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	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area and in Guildford Borough 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.		<p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</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>	
806	Peter	McAtamney	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 and in Guildford Borough will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</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
1045	Kate	McBride	General	The HCA supports the principles of the draft DPD.	None stated.	<p>Support for principles of the Site Allocations, is noted.</p> <p>There will be a further opportunity to comment on this Publication draft Site Allocations document. The Council will keep the HCA informed on any next stages.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
2	John H	McCabe	General	No community money proposed (no indication given as to which proposed site this concerns)	None.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
272	Martin	McCabe	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
272	Martin	McCabe	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	
272	Martin	McCabe	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
272	Martin	McCabe	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
272	Martin	McCabe	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
272	Martin	McCabe	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
272	Martin	McCabe	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
875	Anne	McClean	GB12	Rural setting of village would be lost. Adverse effect on wildlife on the site.	None stated.	As noted within the key requirements for the site, any development would need to carry out tree and ecological surveys, retain amenity trees and landscape features as well as incorporate Green Infrastructure into the scheme.  The exact nature of the road improvement measures will be considered by the County Highways Authority at the Development Management stage of the process. This is proposed to take place post 2027 as the site is recommended by the Council to be safeguarded.  The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.  The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. The impact on landscape character has been 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
						<p>In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p> <p>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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
875	Anne	McClean	GB13	Rural setting of village would be lost. Adverse effect on wildlife on the site.	None stated.	<p>As noted within the key requirements for the site, any development would need to carry out tree and ecological surveys, retain amenity trees and landscape features as well as incorporate Green Infrastructure into the scheme.</p> <p>The exact nature of the road improvement measures will be considered by the County Highways Authority at the Development Management stage of the process. This is proposed to take place post 2027 as the site is recommended by the Council to be safeguarded.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. The impact on landscape character 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> <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</p>	No further modification is 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>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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
875	Anne	McClean	GB12	Site release not recommended in GBR. Other sites more suitable. Only selected as landowner willing to sell. Changes to government policy will protect Green Belt and brownfield sites should be used.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development, safeguarding sites and the Council's approach in terms of consistency with national policy 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
875	Anne	McClean	GB13	Site release not recommended in GBR. Other sites more suitable. Only selected as landowner willing to sell. Changes to government policy will protect Green Belt and brownfield sites should be used.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development, safeguarding sites and the Council's approach in terms of consistency with national policy 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
875	Anne	McClean	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. Proposed Wisley development will increase traffic levels.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The environmental impact of the proposed allocation has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental indicators. The appraisal alongside the other documents within the Council's evidence base indicate that the site is suitable for development whilst making sure that the Green Belt is not undermined in its overall purpose and integrity.</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</p>	No further modification is 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, including Wisley Airfield and wider development proposals. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 is not proposing to increase the retail provision at Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre in the Site Allocations DPD. The existing retail provision meets the day to day needs of local people. By allocating the proposed site for development post 2027, the Council will consider any retail growth in this location as part of the preparation of the next local plan. However if the Council is minded to increase the retail provision, it is not expected that it would be significant and could continue in its function of meeting daily needs.</p>	
875	Anne	McClean	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Pyrford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse.</p> <p>Proposed Wisley development will increase traffic levels.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The environmental impact of the proposed allocation has been carefully considered by the Council. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process has been used to appraise sites for development, taking into account a wide range of environmental indicators. The appraisal alongside the other documents within the Council's evidence base indicate that the site is suitable for development whilst making sure that the Green Belt is not undermined in its overall purpose and integrity.</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, including Wisley Airfield and wider development proposals. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 is not proposing to increase the retail provision at Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre in the Site Allocations DPD. The existing retail provision meets the day to day needs of local people. By allocating the proposed site for development post 2027, the Council will consider any retail growth in this location as part of the preparation of the next local plan. However if the Council is minded to increase the retail provision, it is not expected that it would be significant and could continue in its function of meeting daily needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
875	Anne	McClean	GB12	Will negatively impact a registered park and gardens and Listed Buildings.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).  This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
875	Anne	McClean	GB13	Will negatively impact a registered park and gardens and Listed Buildings.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).  This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
875	Anne	McClean	GB12	Could worsen surface water problem at Church Hill.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
875	Anne	McClean	GB13	Could worsen surface water problem at Church Hill.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Green Belt should be protected and not developed, that is its purpose. How can it be considered for development.	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
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Green Belt should be protected and not developed, that is its purpose. How can it be considered for development.	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
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB12	Pyrford is a small village and development will see a significant increase in people and cars. The road network is busy now and dangerous.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.  The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB13	Pyrford is a small village and development will see a significant increase in people and cars. The road network is busy now and dangerous.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>site specific measures, the 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>	
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB12	Pyrford is congested with little places to park. This has a negative impact on the local economy.	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. The site is also within walking and cycling distance of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre, which meets the day to day needs of local people. This further reduces the need to travel by car and the demand for parking spaces within the neighbourhood centre.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB13	Pyrford is congested with little places to park. This has a negative impact on the local economy.	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</p>	No further modification is 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>improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access 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 site is also within walking and cycling distance of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre, which meets the day to day needs of local people. This further reduces the need to travel by car and the demand for parking spaces within the neighbourhood centre.</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>	
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB12	Major housing proposals alongside the borough boundary with Guildford. Development near Ripley will result in gridlock.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>In addition to the work being carried out with the County Highways Authority, the Council has also worked with the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between Woking Borough Council and the neighbouring authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council and neighbouring authorities 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
1564	Carolyn	McClean	GB13	Major housing proposals alongside the borough boundary with Guildford. Development near Ripley will result in gridlock.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>In addition to the work being carried out with the County Highways Authority, the Council has also worked with the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between Woking Borough Council and the neighbouring authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council and neighbouring authorities 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
1615	B	McConville	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	
1615	B	McConville	GB7	A sequential approach must be undertaken to identify suitable sites. No urban sites have been considered and there is doubt to the validity of no other sites in the borough being identified or suitable. Mayford does not have good access to jobs, infrastructure or services and therefore does not satisfy the sequential approach criteria.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB7	Object to proposals. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed leisure centre, running track and other facilities. These are inappropriate development within a residential area and do not meet the Council's own stated 800m separation policy.	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.		the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1615	B	McConville	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and</p>	No further modification is 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>nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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>	
1615	B	McConville	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1615	B	McConville	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				inappropriate development			
1615	B	McConville	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	The additional visits per week will have negative impact on an already overloaded road network whilst the public transport in the area is dire.	None stated.	<p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	The hours of operation will have a major impact on residents and surrounding local area. It is inappropriate and shows a clear lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	<p>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.</p> <p>The Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1615	B	McConville	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1615	B	McConville	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	
1615	B	McConville	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
1615	B	McConville	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
				Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.			
1615	B	McConville	GB8	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.  The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	
1615	B	McConville	GB9	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for residents including space for business activities. These activities are out of keeping in this location due to the proximity of houses and heritage assets.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development will help 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.	
1615	B	McConville	GB8	Accept that the proposed secondary school represents a special circumstance for development in the Green Belt, and I support the mitigation measures noted for the school.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB9	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
1615	B	McConville	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
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB7	I completely object to the proposed increase in Traveller Pitches. We are already overloaded with Traveller Pitches in and around 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
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB10	Mayford must not become a suburb of Woking or coalesce with Guildford. This would be a catastrophe and completely subvert the purpose of the Green Belt. Mayford is a jewel in the Borough of Woking and should remain so.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB11	Mayford must not become a suburb of Woking or coalesce with Guildford. This would be a catastrophe and completely subvert the purpose of the Green Belt. Mayford is a jewel in the Borough of Woking and should remain so.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB7	Mayford must not become a suburb of Woking or coalesce with Guildford. This would be a catastrophe and completely subvert the purpose of the Green Belt. Mayford is a jewel in the Borough of Woking and should remain so.	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 physical separation between Woking and Guildford will be undermined by the proposals. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB8	Mayford must not become a suburb of Woking or coalesce with Guildford. This would be a catastrophe and completely subvert the purpose of the Green Belt. Mayford is a jewel in the Borough of Woking and should remain so.	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
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB9	Mayford must not become a suburb of Woking or coalesce with Guildford. This would be a catastrophe and completely subvert the purpose of the Green Belt. Mayford is a jewel in the Borough of Woking and should remain so.	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
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB8	I strongly object to additional housing in this 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB11	My remarks for GB9, GB10 and GB11 are the same as for GB8.	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, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB10	Prey Heath Road has no pavements, any increase in pedestrian traffic could prove fatal.  Please reconsider your plans and take the response of Mayford Village Society into account regarding your existing plans.	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB11	Prey Heath Road has no pavements, any increase in pedestrian traffic could prove fatal.  Please reconsider your plans and take the response of Mayford Village Society into account regarding your existing plans.	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB7	<p>Prey Heath Road has no pavements, any increase in pedestrian traffic could prove fatal.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans and take the response of Mayford Village Society into account regarding your existing plans.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB8	<p>Prey Heath Road has no pavements, any increase in pedestrian traffic could prove fatal.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans and take the response of Mayford Village Society into account regarding your existing plans.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
215	Edmund	McDonald	GB9	<p>Prey Heath Road has no pavements, any increase in pedestrian traffic could prove fatal.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans and take the response of Mayford Village Society into account regarding your existing plans.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB13	There are no significant workplaces or railway stations within easy walking distance, meaning hundreds of extra cars will use rural and residential roads in Pyrford. Many routes south [of Pyrford] have weight and width restrictions and traffic is affected by slight disturbances (roadworks/ accidents).	None stated.	<p>It is correct that the site is not located within walking distance of any significant employment areas or railway stations, such as Woking Town Centre or West Byfleet Station. However as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, 'development of the site brings an opportunity to improve accessibility to the District Centre and West Byfleet railway station, through the provision of new/improved sustainable transport infrastructure'.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB12	There are no significant workplaces or railway stations within easy walking distance, meaning hundreds of extra cars will use rural and residential roads in Pyrford. Many routes south [of Pyrford] have weight and width restrictions and traffic is affected by slight disturbances (roadworks/ accidents).	None stated.	<p>It is correct that the site is not located within walking distance of any significant employment areas or railway stations, such as Woking Town Centre or West Byfleet Station. However as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, 'development of the site brings an opportunity to improve accessibility to the District Centre and West Byfleet railway station, through the provision of new/improved sustainable transport infrastructure'.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
615	Neil	McEvoy	General	The varied habitat and species around Upshot Lane will be destroyed if development proceeds.	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
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB13	Local schools and medical facilities will not cope with the residents of more than 400 homes.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate 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>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB12	Local schools and medical facilities will not cope with the residents of more than 400 homes.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate 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>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB13	The fields are a vital part of the Green Belt and development would destroy the semi-rural character of Pyrford, particularly Aviary Road as a conservation area.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review methodology has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0. In addition, paragraph 4.3.9 of the review states that parcel 9, which is adjacent to the existing urban area, is considered to be suitable for development.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence document that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Landscape Character Assessment and Strategic Transport Impact Assessment has also been used in identifying sites for existing and future development needs.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape and character impacts has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 19.0.</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. 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
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB12	The fields are a vital part of the Green Belt and development would destroy the semi-rural character of Pyrford, particularly Aviary Road as a conservation area.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review methodology has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0. In addition, paragraph 4.3.9 of the review states that parcel 9, which is adjacent to the existing urban area, is considered to be suitable for development.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence document that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Landscape Character Assessment and Strategic Transport Impact Assessment has also been used in identifying sites for existing and future development needs.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape and character impacts has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 19.0.</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. 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
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB13	The developments are wrong with regard to long term planning principles, and grossly impractical. The fields must remain.	The fields must remain.	<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. Based on the information in Section 1.0 and in the opinion of the Council, the case for releasing Green Belt land has been established and is consistent with national planning policy.</p> <p>The Council notes the representation and proposed modification to retain the fields. It should be noted that these site will make a significant contribution towards meeting the local housing requirement. Not allocating these sites or having new sites to replace them could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. It would also require the Council to carry out another Green Belt boundary review to identify further sites for future development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
615	Neil	McEvoy	GB12	The developments are wrong with regard to long term planning principles, and grossly impractical. The fields must remain.	The fields must remain.	<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. Based on the information in Section 1.0 and in the opinion of the Council, the case for releasing Green Belt land has been established and is consistent with national planning policy.</p> <p>The Council notes the representation and proposed modification to retain the fields. It should be noted that these site will make a significant contribution towards meeting the local housing requirement. Not allocating these sites or having new sites to replace them could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. It would also require the Council to carry out another Green Belt boundary review to identify further sites for future development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
615	Neil	McEvoy	General	The proposals would add extra traffic to inadequate roads, leading to congestion, wasted time and fields and unacceptable levels of atmospheric pollutants.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Core Strategy (2012) policies and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD (due to be examined in May 2016) contain policies to control atmospheric pollutants arising from development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
592	Elaine	McGinty	UA16	The cultural centre has potential to be part of a growing and vibrant mixed use town centre. As more residents live near the station they will have a social area and expanding cultural centre, as well as a hotel, shops (Marks and Spencer) and food outlets.	None stated.	It is agreed that social and community facilities are an important part of creating a sustainable town centre and Borough. The exact type and location of these facilities will be considered by the Council and should be in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
592	Elaine	McGinty	UA16	This area on this side of town has accommodated live music venues before.	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
592	Elaine	McGinty	UA18	At this stage, there is potential for proper planning to ensure happy co-existence of a music venue with dwellings in a mixed use area.	None stated.	The exact nature of the development, its internal layout and the siting of different uses will be set out in detail during the planning application process. At this stage, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to identify the location for development as well as the intended use(s). The Council has a robust policy framework in place to ensure that sources of noise pollution are controlled and suitable mitigation measures are introduced. This includes the Core Strategy (CS21) and the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
592	Elaine	McGinty	UA18	Inclusion of the Phoenix Cultural Centre CIC activities in a fit for purpose venue and accessible town centre location will bring cohesion to town centre residents, provide an economic attraction and add to the town's night time economy.	Consider inclusion of the Phoenix Cultural Centre CIC at this site.	The Council agrees that the redevelopment of this site should have a positive impact on the town centre economy as well as enhance this part of the town centre. The allocation seeks to determine the principle of development, which includes community, leisure, office, retail and residential accommodation. The occupiers/tenants of the site post development will be considered at both the planning application stage as well as during/after construction. It is therefore not suitable at this stage to allocate sites for specific companies or organisations. The Council, outside of the planning process, will where possible work with local companies and charities in helping to meet their needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
592	Elaine	McGinty	UA18	Believes the Phoenix Cultural Centre CIC could operate on the site as a community live music and cultural venue in an accessible town centre location, particularly for new town centre residents.	None stated.	This idea is noted and would potentially fit with the community and leisure uses proposed in the allocation. The Council encourages further dialogue and a potential meeting to discuss opportunities for this site (please contact us at <a href="mailto:planning.policy@woking.gov.uk">planning.policy@woking.gov.uk</a> ).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
592	Elaine	McGinty	UA16	To ensure vibrancy from use of the ground floor and reflecting the cultural offer of the town, this would be a good site for Phoenix Cultural Centre CIC.	Consider inclusion of the Phoenix Cultural Centre CIC at this site (for example, to the text, in the area allocated by the railway site boundary).	The Council agrees that this site should offer an active ground floor frontage to enhance the street scene and vibrancy of the area. This will be considered in detail at the planning application stage. The occupiers/tenants of the site post development will be considered at both the planning application stage as well as during/after construction. It is therefore not suitable at this stage to allocate sites for specific companies or organisations. The Council, outside of the planning process, will where possible work with local companies and charities in helping to meet their needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
592	Elaine	McGinty	UA16	This already encompasses a social club and the railway allows for a buffer should a venue be included. Land next to railways is used across the country for cultural and live music venues, coexists well and is near to transport links. It also enhances the night time economy.	None stated.	<p>As set out within the key requirements for the site, the re-provision or relocation of the existing community facility should be sought as part of any redevelopment scheme. The key requirements also set out that the development should mitigate the impact of noise from the adjacent railway line to protect residential amenity. This is further supported by Core Strategy Policy CS21 and the Development Management Policies DPD.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS19: Social and community infrastructure, sets out that the Council will promote new and protect existing social and community facilities in the Borough. The Council recognise the importance of these assets to the Borough.</p> <p>The exact amount, nature and siting of development at this site will be considered 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB8	Concerned that the proposals for the area will have a negative impact on the character and local community	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB9	Concerned that the proposals for the area will have a negative impact on the character and local community	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB10	Concerned that the proposals for the area will have a negative impact on the character and local community	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB11	Concerned that the proposals for the area will have a negative impact on the character and local community	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB8	Proposals will have a negative 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.</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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB9	Proposals will have a negative 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.</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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB10	Proposals will have a negative 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.</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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB11	Proposals will have a negative 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.	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>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>	of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB8	<p>Object to proposals as the local highways is unsuitable- particularly on Saunders Lane and Egley Road. Most roads are narrow and there are several single road bridges. Roads lack pavements and are therefore dangerous for pedestrians e.g Prey Heath Road.</p> <p>The proposals will increase traffic and cause chaos on roads. The GBBR report suggests its 7 mins between Mayford and Woking- this does not take into account traffic.</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. 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. This is set out under the key requirements.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB9	<p>Object to proposals as the local highways is unsuitable- particularly on Saunders Lane and Egley Road. Most roads are narrow and there are several single road bridges. Roads lack pavements and are therefore dangerous for pedestrians e.g Prey Heath Road.</p> <p>The proposals will increase traffic and cause chaos on roads. The GBBR report suggests its 7 mins between Mayford and Woking- this does not take into account traffic.</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. 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. This is set out under the key requirements.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB10	<p>Object to proposals as the local highways is unsuitable- particularly on Saunders Lane and Egley Road. Most roads are narrow and there are several single road bridges. Roads lack pavements and are therefore dangerous for pedestrians e.g Prey Heath Road.</p> <p>The proposals will increase traffic and cause chaos on roads. The GBBR report suggests its 7 mins between Mayford and Woking- this does not take into account traffic.</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. 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. This is set out under the key requirements.</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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
350	Alison	McGrath	GB11	Object to proposals as the local highways is unsuitable- particularly on Saunders Lane and Egley Road. Most roads are narrow and there are several single road bridges. Roads lack pavements and are therefore dangerous for pedestrians e.g Prey Heath Road. The proposals will increase traffic and cause chaos on roads. The GBBR report suggests its 7 mins between Mayford and Woking- this does not take into account traffic.	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. 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. This is set out under the key requirements.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB7	Object to further Traveller pitches on the site. Mayford already makes a significant contribution with other sites near by. There is no justification for expansion. Ten Acre is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common (SSSI), expansion of the site will impact on wildlife and decrease the 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB8	A purpose of the GB is to keep towns separate. Proposals will merge Mayford with 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB9	A purpose of the GB is to keep towns separate. Proposals will merge Mayford with 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB10	A purpose of the GB is to keep towns separate. Proposals will merge Mayford with 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB11	A purpose of the GB is to keep towns separate. Proposals will merge Mayford with 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB8	Consider brownfield sites before greenfield. The GBBR report does not fully consider the suitability or impact of the proposals.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 17.0, Section 16.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, Section 10.0.	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
				Developers have been waiting for the opportunity to build on GB land.		In addition, the Site Allocation is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which has reviewed the potential impacts of proposals.	
350	Alison	McGrath	GB9	Consider brownfield sites before greenfield. The GBBR report does not fully consider the suitability or impact of the proposals. Developers have been waiting for the opportunity to build on GB land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 17.0, Section 16.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, Section 10.0.  In addition, the Site Allocation is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which has reviewed the potential impacts of proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB10	Consider brownfield sites before greenfield. The GBBR report does not fully consider the suitability or impact of the proposals. Developers have been waiting for the opportunity to build on GB land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 17.0, Section 16.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, Section 10.0.  In addition, the Site Allocation is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which has reviewed the potential impacts of proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB11	Consider brownfield sites before greenfield. The GBBR report does not fully consider the suitability or impact of the proposals. Developers have been waiting for the opportunity to build on GB land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 17.0, Section 16.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, Section 10.0.  In addition, the Site Allocation is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which has reviewed the potential impacts of proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
350	Alison	McGrath	GB8	A purpose of the GB is to maintain its openness. This has been raised as an issue on individual planning applications. Therefore the proposals appear contrary to this purpose	None stated.	Your application would have been considered on its individual merits.  The 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB9	A purpose of the GB is to maintain its openness. This has been raised as an issue on individual planning applications. Therefore the proposals appear contrary to this purpose	None stated.	Your application would have been considered on its individual merits.  The 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB10	A purpose of the GB is to maintain its openness. This has been raised as an issue on individual planning applications. Therefore the proposals appear contrary to this purpose	None stated.	Your application would have been considered on its individual merits.  The 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
350	Alison	McGrath	GB11	A purpose of the GB is to maintain its openness. This has been raised as an issue on individual planning applications. Therefore the proposals appear contrary to this purpose	None stated.	Your application would have been considered on its individual merits.  The 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
805	Des	McGrath	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.	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
805	Des	McGrath	General	Strongly object to building houses on Mayford sites.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB7	Object to the proposal. 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. The site is considered to contain contaminated land, physically constrained and has poor access to amenities. The GBBR states it is unsuitable for Travellers so why is it being considered. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p> <p>In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.</p>	
805	Des	McGrath	General	Wildlife will be affected and increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	General	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. 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
805	Des	McGrath	GB8	The site lies below the Escarpment and is prone to flooding. There is no mention of this in the report and how it will be mitigated.	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
805	Des	McGrath	GB9	The site lies below the Escarpment and is prone to flooding. There is no mention of this in the report and how it will be mitigated.	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
805	Des	McGrath	GB10	The site lies below the Escarpment and is prone to flooding. There is no mention of this in the report and how it will be mitigated.	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
805	Des	McGrath	GB11	The site lies below the Escarpment and is prone to flooding. There is no mention of this in the report and how it will be mitigated.	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
805	Des	McGrath	GB14	The site lies below the Escarpment and is prone to flooding. There is no mention of this in the report and how it will be mitigated.	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
805	Des	McGrath	General	GBBR only considered sites put forward but maybe more suitable sites can be found if landowners were approached. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Easy option has been taken as sites are owned by developers. Plans are based on unsound research and the scale and size of the proposals are unsuitable for Mayford. The Council are also picking and choosing which recommendations from the GBBR it uses for its decisions.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review methodology is clearly set out within the document. The Council believes that the approach taken is suitable, robust and comprehensive. The methodology for assessing the Green Belt in the Green Belt boundary review is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding brownfield sites, sites available for development and proposed densities has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, 13.0 and 18.0.</p> <p>Based on the comprehensive and substantial evidence set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is satisfied that the approach it has taken is robust and consistent with the NPPF.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB8	Development would have a devastating impact on Mayford and there is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB9	Development would have a devastating impact on Mayford and there is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB10	Development would have a devastating impact on Mayford and there is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB11	Development would have a devastating impact on Mayford and there is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB14	Development would have a devastating impact on Mayford and there is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	General	No consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure and there will be gridlock.	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
805	Des	McGrath	GB9	There is very poor public transport in Mayford and no village centre, doctor or dentist.	None stated.	<p>The existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
805	Des	McGrath	GB10	There is very poor public transport in Mayford and no village centre, doctor or dentist.	None stated.	<p>The existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
805	Des	McGrath	GB11	There is very poor public transport in Mayford and no village centre, doctor or dentist.	None stated.	<p>The existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
805	Des	McGrath	GB14	There is very poor public transport in Mayford and no village centre, doctor or dentist.	None stated.	<p>The existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision 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
						overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
805	Des	McGrath	GB8	There is very poor public transport in Mayford and no village centre, doctor or dentist.	None stated.	<p>The representation noting the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB8	An up to date traffic report needs to be produced for Mayford before any decisions are made for additional housing. The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Additional homes in the local area and development within Guildford Borough will make this much worse. Please advise where in the GBBR it mentions traffic impacts. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR does not reflect the current situation in Mayford.	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>As stated above, the strategic transport studies carried out by the County Highways Authority will take into account consented and under construction development schemes from within the Borough and the wider area.</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 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> <p>It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence base document that the Council has taken into consideration in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The full list is set out within Appendix 1 of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
805	Des	McGrath	GB9	An up to date traffic report needs to be produced for Mayford before any decisions are made for additional housing. The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Additional homes in the local area and development within Guildford Borough will make this much worse. Please advise where in the GBBR it mentions traffic impacts. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR does not reflect the current situation in Mayford.	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>As stated above, the strategic transport studies carried out by the County Highways Authority will take into account consented and under construction development schemes from within the Borough and the wider area.</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 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> <p>It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence base document that the Council has taken into consideration in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The full list is set out within Appendix 1 of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB10	An up to date traffic report needs to be produced for Mayford before any decisions are made for additional housing. The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Additional homes in the local area and development within Guildford Borough will make this much worse. Please advise where in the GBBR it mentions traffic impacts. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR does not reflect the current situation in Mayford.	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>As stated above, the strategic transport studies carried out by the County Highways Authority will take into account consented and under construction development schemes from within the Borough and the wider area.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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> <p>It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence base document that the Council has taken into consideration in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The full list is set out within Appendix 1 of the DPD.</p>	
805	Des	McGrath	GB11	An up to date traffic report needs to be produced for Mayford before any decisions are made for additional housing. The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Additional homes in the local area and development within Guildford Borough will make this much worse. Please advise where in the GBBR it mentions traffic impacts. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR does not reflect the current situation in Mayford.	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>As stated above, the strategic transport studies carried out by the County Highways Authority will take into account consented and under construction development schemes from within the Borough and the wider area.</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 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> <p>It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence base document that the Council has taken into consideration in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The full list is set out within Appendix 1 of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
805	Des	McGrath	GB14	An up to date traffic report needs to be produced for Mayford before any decisions are made for additional housing. The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Additional homes in the local area and development within Guildford Borough will make this much worse. Please advise where in the GBBR it mentions traffic impacts. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station. The GBBR does not reflect the current situation in Mayford.	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>As stated above, the strategic transport studies carried out by the County Highways Authority will take into account consented and under construction development schemes from within the Borough and the wider area.</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</p>	No further modification is 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>support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 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> <p>It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is only one evidence base document that the Council has taken into consideration in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The full list is set out within Appendix 1 of the DPD.</p>	
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB12	Road infrastructure can not cope, particularly due to the effect of issues on the A3 or M25 in and around West Byfleet. Also school run hours and road maintenance have a negative impacts on traffic.	None stated.	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support demand generated by that development. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB13	Road infrastructure can not cope, particularly due to the effect of issues on the A3 or M25 in and around West Byfleet. Also school run hours and road maintenance have a negative impacts on traffic.	None stated.	The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support demand generated by that development. This is outlined in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB12	Overdevelopment would impact on local infrastructure and the well being of existing residents.	None stated.	The development being put forward is not considered to be overdevelopment. It will be accompanied by adequate infrastructure to mitigate its effects, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In terms of healthcare, The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. In terms of rail capacity, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers as part of Transport for Woking to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB13	Overdevelopment would impact on local infrastructure and the well being of existing residents.	None stated.	The development being put forward is not considered to be overdevelopment. It will be accompanied by adequate infrastructure to mitigate its effects, as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In terms of healthcare, The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. In terms of rail capacity, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers as part of Transport for Woking to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB12	Astonished at the amount of house building in the Woking area over the last 20 years.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB13	Astonished at the amount of house building in the Woking area over the last 20 years.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB12	Trains to London are running above capacity at present.	None stated.	This comment 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB13	Trains to London are running above capacity at present.	None stated.	This comment 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
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB12	Retention of the Green Belt has always been a top priority in all resident surveys	None stated.	Comment noted. However the justification for Green Belt release can be found in Section 1 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 2.0 is also relevant, on safeguarded sites).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB13	Retention of the Green Belt has always been a top priority in all resident surveys	None stated.	Comment noted. However the justification for Green Belt release can be found in Section 1 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 2.0 is also relevant, on safeguarded sites).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB12	Expresses concern about the removal of this site from the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and this is an important attribute for these sites, that should be preserved and enhanced.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 7.0, particularly paragraph 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
452	Tracey	McGuigan	GB13	Expresses concern about the removal of this site from the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and the open views across this site from Sandy Lane are unique and should be preserved and enhanced.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 7.0, particularly paragraph 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
568	M A	McHarg-Parry	GB15	The greatest problem is infrastructure, and particularly in inability of the A245 to cope with additional traffic. It is already over its design capacity. Questions what is planned by Surrey Highways Authority to deal with this problem. Installation of a roundabout would worsen the problem and the only realistic solution would be a Bypass. This would be expensive, bring the whole project into question, but if no proper relief if provided on Parvis Road should development take place at all?	None stated.	This representation 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
568	M A	McHarg-Parry	GB16	The greatest problem is infrastructure, and particularly in inability of the A245 to cope with additional traffic. It is already over its design capacity. Questions what is planned by Surrey Highways Authority to deal with this problem. Installation of a roundabout would worsen the problem and the only realistic solution would be a Bypass. This would be expensive, bring the whole project into question, but if no proper relief if provided on Parvis Road should development take place at all?	None stated.	This representation 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
568	M A	McHarg-Parry	GB15	The land at both sites is available but post development will leave West Byfleet with virtually no Green Belt to prevent the village merging.	None stated.	<p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. 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.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review notes that although the separation between Byfleet and West Byfleet will reduce as a result of development, it should be highlighted that development already stretches along the northern side of Parvis Road up to the M25. The M25 also forms a buffer between the two areas, limiting the perception of narrowing the gap.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
568	M A	McHarg-Parry	GB16	The land at both sites is available but post development will leave West Byfleet with virtually not Green Belt to prevent the village merging.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review notes that although the separation between Byfleet and West Byfleet will reduce as a result of development, it should be highlighted that development already stretches along the northern side of Parvis Road up to the M25. The M25 also forms a buffer between the two areas, limiting the perception of narrowing the gap.</p>	
568	M A	McHarg-Parry	GB15	Since the push for such large scale developments is Government led it seems almost certain they will go ahead.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD which was published for consultation in 2015 sets out the Council's initial draft Plan. The document has not been finalised and will be amended several times before it is adopted by the Council in 2017/2018. Nevertheless it is important to note that all the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
568	M A	McHarg-Parry	GB16	Since the push for such large scale developments is Government led it seems almost certain they will go ahead.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD which was published for consultation in 2015 sets out the Council's initial draft Plan. The document has not been finalised and will be amended several times before it is adopted by the Council in 2017/2018. Nevertheless it is important to note that all the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This matter has been addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
157	Julia	McHugh	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 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,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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,	
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	None stated.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed	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	No further modification is 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 railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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.	
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from	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
					the DPD for the reasons stated above.		
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommends a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	The Council 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
157	Julia	McHugh	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	The 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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. 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
175	David	McHugh	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	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,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	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.	
175	David	McHugh	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
175	David	McHugh	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.  The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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
175	David	McHugh	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. 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
175	David	McHugh	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from	The 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
					the DPD.		
175	David	McHugh	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. The Council is satisfied that the number of pitches on the site can be increased without undermining the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB10	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded by the proposals. Local roads, including Egley Road are already congested. Proposals will cause further delays and is bad for the environment	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB11	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded by the proposals. Local roads, including Egley Road are already congested. Proposals will cause further delays and is bad for the environment	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
345	F	McIntyre	GB14	The transport infrastructure will be overloaded by the proposals. Local roads, including Egley Road are already congested. Proposals will cause further delays and is bad for the environment	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB10	The proposed densities of 30dph are excessive for the context. The average density is currently 5.5 dph or less within the Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB11	The proposed densities of 30dph are excessive for the context. The average density is currently 5.5 dph or less within the Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB14	The proposed densities of 30dph are excessive for the context. The average density is currently 5.5 dph or less within the Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB10	Object to proposals at Hook Heath. The purpose of the GB is to prevent sprawl, maintain open spaces and to maintain separation of Mayford and Woking. GB help to maintain the balance between the rural and urban areas	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB11	Object to proposals at Hook Heath. The purpose of the GB is to prevent sprawl, maintain open spaces and to maintain separation of Mayford and Woking. GB help to maintain the balance between the rural and urban areas	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB14	Object to proposals at Hook Heath. The purpose of the GB is to prevent sprawl, maintain open spaces and to maintain separation of Mayford and Woking. GB help to maintain the balance between the rural and urban areas	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB10	Please consider carefully. Proposals will change the character of the area and prompt people to leave	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB11	Please consider carefully. Proposals will change the character of the area and prompt people to leave	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB14	Please consider carefully. Proposals will change the character of the area and prompt people to leave	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 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
345	F	McIntyre	GB10	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the identification of 550 homes within the GB up to 2027. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances for the further identification of land for 1200 post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB11	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the identification of 550 homes within the GB up to 2027. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances for the further identification of land for 1200 post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
345	F	McIntyre	GB14	National policy allows for the release of GB land in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the identification of 550 homes within the GB up to 2027. However WBC have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances for the further identification of land for 1200 post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 , and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
535	Jane	McKay	GB12	Objects to the proposal, and agrees with the views expressed and points raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	Objection noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The issues raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum are considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
535	Jane	McKay	GB13	Objects to the proposal, and agrees with the views expressed and points raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	Objection noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The issues raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum are considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
87	Brian	McKendry	GB7	I am writing with reference to the section relating to Hook Heath and Mayford. As a regular user of Egley Road during rush hours I am all too aware of current congestion levels. The proposals would greatly increase the volume of traffic on this road. There must be a real risk that Egley Road would not be able to cope. No proposal in the document which addresses this problem. The main reason for the potential increase in traffic is the high density of dwellings proposed, far in excess of those currently in Hook Heath or the Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	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
87	Brian	McKendry	GB7	The approach to the proposed developments appears to sacrifice Green Belt land with no particular care as to its purpose of ensuring the separation of various communities. Once sacrificed, Green Belt will not be recovered. In this instance it will mean both Hook Heath and Mayford will become virtually indistinguishable from Woking. The resultant urban sprawl will be precisely what the Green Belt was meant to stop happening. Part of the reason is the document goes further than is needed to plan to 2040 when the requirement is only to plan for the period to 2027; why is this longer time frame needed? The diminution of Green Belt land is only to be in response to “exceptional circumstances”; these are not defined in the document. Specific proposals beyond 2027 are not needed and should not be advanced. Attitudes and perceived needs could well change before planning for the period 2027 to 2040 is required.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will be undermined by the proposals. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The DPD is clear to emphasise that the safeguarded sites will only be release for development as part of the review of the Core Strategy and/or the Site Allocations DPD. Any new information will be considered before their release.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
87	Brian	McKendry	GB8	I am writing with reference to the section relating to Hook Heath and Mayford. As a regular user of Egley Road during rush hours I am all too aware of current congestion levels. The proposals would greatly increase the volume of traffic on this road. There must be a real risk that Egley Road would	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				not be able to cope. No proposal in the document which addresses this problem. The main reason for the potential increase in traffic is the high density of dwellings proposed, far in excess of those currently in Hook Heath or the Fishers Hill Conservation Area.			
87	Brian	McKendry	GB8	The approach to the proposed developments appears to sacrifice Green Belt land with no particular care as to its purpose of ensuring the separation of various communities. Once sacrificed, Green Belt will not be recovered. In this instance it will mean both Hook Heath and Mayford will become virtually indistinguishable from Woking. The resultant urban sprawl will be precisely what the Green Belt was meant to stop happening. Part of the reason is the document goes further than is needed to plan to 2040 when the requirement is only to plan for the period to 2027; why is this longer time frame needed? The diminution of Green Belt land is only to be in response to “exceptional circumstances”; these are not defined in the document. Specific proposals beyond 2027 are not needed and should not be advanced. Attitudes and perceived needs could well change before planning for the period 2027 to 2040 is required.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific justification for safeguarding land beyond 2027 is set out in detail in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
87	Brian	McKendry	GB9	I am writing with reference to the section relating to Hook Heath and Mayford. As a regular user of Egley Road during rush hours I am all too aware of current congestion levels. The proposals would greatly increase the volume of traffic on this road. There must be a real risk that Egley Road would not be able to cope. No proposal in the document which addresses this problem. The main reason for the potential increase in traffic is the high density of dwellings proposed, far in excess of those currently in Hook Heath or the Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	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
87	Brian	McKendry	GB9	The approach to the proposed developments appears to sacrifice Green Belt land with no particular care as to its purpose of ensuring the separation of various communities. Once sacrificed, Green Belt will not be recovered. In this instance it will mean both Hook Heath and Mayford will become virtually indistinguishable from Woking. The resultant urban sprawl will be precisely what the Green Belt was meant to stop happening. Part of the reason is the document goes further than is needed to plan to 2040 when the requirement is only to plan for the period to 2027; why is this longer time frame needed? The diminution of Green Belt land is only to be in response to “exceptional circumstances”; these are not defined in the document. Specific proposals beyond 2027 are not needed and should not be advanced. Attitudes and perceived needs could well change before planning for the period 2027 to 2040 is required.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The specific justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs between 2027 and 2040 is comprehensively addressed in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
87	Brian	McKendry	GB10	I am writing with reference to the section relating to Hook Heath and Mayford. As a regular user of Egley Road during rush hours I am all too aware of current congestion levels. The proposals would greatly increase the volume of traffic on this road. There must be a real risk that Egley Road would not be able to cope. No proposal in the document which addresses this problem. The main reason for the potential increase in traffic is the high density of dwellings proposed, far in excess of those currently in Hook Heath or the Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	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 in 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
87	Brian	McKendry	GB10	The approach to the proposed developments appears to sacrifice Green Belt land with no particular care as to its purpose of ensuring the separation of various communities.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Once sacrificed, Green Belt will not be recovered. In this instance it will mean both Hook Heath and Mayford will become virtually indistinguishable from Woking. The resultant urban sprawl will be precisely what the Green Belt was meant to stop happening. Part of the reason is the document goes further than is needed to plan to 2040 when the requirement is only to plan for the period to 2027; why is this longer time frame needed? The diminution of Green Belt land is only to be in response to “exceptional circumstances”; these are not defined in the document. Specific proposals beyond 2027 are not needed and should not be advanced. Attitudes and perceived needs could well change before planning for the period 2027 to 2040 is required.		general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	
87	Brian	McKendry	GB11	I am writing with reference to the section relating to Hook Heath and Mayford. As a regular user of Egley Road during rush hours I am all too aware of current congestion levels. The proposals would greatly increase the volume of traffic on this road. There must be a real risk that Egley Road would not be able to cope. No proposal in the document which addresses this problem. The main reason for the potential increase in traffic is the high density of dwellings proposed, far in excess of those currently in Hook Heath or the Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	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. See Section 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
87	Brian	McKendry	GB11	The approach to the proposed developments appears to sacrifice Green Belt land with no particular care as to its purpose of ensuring the separation of various communities. Once sacrificed, Green Belt will not be recovered. In this instance it will mean both Hook Heath and Mayford will become virtually indistinguishable from Woking. The resultant urban sprawl will be precisely what the Green Belt was meant to stop happening. Part of the reason is the document goes further than is needed to plan to 2040 when the requirement is only to plan for the period to 2027; why is this longer time frame needed? The diminution of Green Belt land is only to be in response to “exceptional circumstances”; these are not defined in the document. Specific proposals beyond 2027 are not needed and should not be advanced. Attitudes and perceived needs could well change before planning for the period 2027 to 2040 is required.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
87	Brian	McKendry	GB14	I am writing with reference to the section relating to Hook Heath and Mayford. As a regular user of Egley Road during rush hours I am all too aware of current congestion levels. The proposals would greatly increase the volume of traffic on this road. There must be a real risk that Egley Road would not be able to cope. No proposal in the document which addresses this problem. The main reason for the potential increase in traffic is the high density of dwellings proposed, far in excess of those currently in Hook Heath or the Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	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
87	Brian	McKendry	GB14	The approach to the proposed developments appears to sacrifice Green Belt land with no particular care as to its purpose of ensuring the separation of various communities. Once sacrificed, Green Belt will not be recovered. In this instance it will mean both Hook Heath and Mayford will become virtually indistinguishable from Woking. The resultant urban sprawl will be precisely what the Green Belt was meant to stop happening. Part of the reason is the document goes further than is needed to plan to 2040 when the requirement is only to plan for the period to 2027; why is this longer time frame needed? The diminution of Green Belt	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This matter is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				land is only to be in response to “exceptional circumstances”; these are not defined in the document. Specific proposals beyond 2027 are not needed and should not be advanced. Attitudes and perceived needs could well change before planning for the period 2027 to 2040 is required.		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.	
1389	Ian	McLean	GB12	Notes that traffic survey road strips have been installed in the past 24 hours, but as many schools have broken up for the summer break, the data collected will not be representative of the issues faced by road users at peak times of the year.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1389	Ian	McLean	GB13	Notes that traffic survey road strips have been installed in the past 24 hours, but as many schools have broken up for the summer break, the data collected will not be representative of the issues faced by road users at peak times of the year.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1389	Ian	McLean	GB12	Concerned about the capacity of local road infrastructure to cope with the proposed expansion of local housing. Local lanes are already carrying high volumes of traffic, and details locations where there are queues at rush hour. The proposals will compound existing traffic flow problems.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1389	Ian	McLean	GB13	Concerned about the capacity of local road infrastructure to cope with the proposed expansion of local housing. Local lanes are already carrying high volumes of traffic, and details locations where there are queues at rush hour. The proposals will compound existing traffic flow problems.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB12	Extensive loss of Green Belt land	None stated.	Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB13	Extensive loss of Green Belt land	None stated.	Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB12	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8 to 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB13	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8 to 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB12	Few alternatives considered by WBC considering the demographics of the area including affordable housing and elderly accommodation.	None stated.	<p>The Council has set out in the Site Allocations DPD that certain sites will be required to deliver affordable housing and/or elderly accommodation as part of a development scheme. In addition, Policy CS12 and CS13 set out the Council's requirements for affordable housing and that it encourages the provision of specialist accommodation in sustainable locations in the Borough.</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. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB13	Few alternatives considered by WBC considering the demographics of the area including affordable housing and elderly accommodation.	None stated.	<p>The Council has set out in the Site Allocations DPD that certain sites will be required to deliver affordable housing and/or elderly accommodation as part of a development scheme. In addition, Policy CS12 and CS13 set out the Council's requirements for affordable housing and that it encourages the provision of specialist accommodation in sustainable locations in the Borough.</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. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
728	I	McVeigh	GB12	The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and community have not been taken into account.	None stated.	The regulation 18 consultation provides all members of the community with an opportunity to comment on the draft Site Allocations DPD. The community will also be given the opportunity to comment at the regulation 19 consultation stage as well as at the Examination in Public. The Council has considered the views of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB13	The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and community have not been taken into account.	None stated.	The regulation 18 consultation provides all members of the community with an opportunity to comment on the draft Site Allocations DPD. The community will also be given the opportunity to comment at the regulation 19 consultation stage as well as at the Examination in Public. The Council has considered the views of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	General	Urge WBC and Planning Policy to further consider the plans and listen to the views of local residents to come to a suitable outcome that is agreeable to all that does not destroy the character of the village and the surrounding countryside.	None stated.	In following the prescribed consultation requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Council will be undertaking a further public consultation in due course (Regulation 19). Following this there will be an Examination in Public where local stakeholders and the community will be able to express their views on the Site Allocations DPD if they feel that they have been ignored. In following the relevant regulations the Council is satisfied that the correct process has and will continue to be followed.  Overall, the Council believes that the proposed allocations will not undermine the existing character of Borough. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. It would overwhelm the village and have a negative impact on its character.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
728	I	McVeigh	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. It would overwhelm the village and have a negative impact on its character.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	Request wider communication with local residents on development proposals.	Ask that communication be with a wider area of local residents so that they are aware of, and may comment on, developments in their communities.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6. Nevertheless, the Council values community involvement and will continue to involve the community in the next stages of the DPD. It intends to publish the document again for Regulation 19 consultation in Summer 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	Highlights the lack of neighbourhood forum in a diverse area.	None stated.	The Council will continue to encourage communities to form Neighbourhood Forums to plan for the areas. However, the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan is not a requirement but a choice that local communities have to make. The Hook Heath Neighbourhood Area has now got an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. This could serve as an example for others to follow in the future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	Little consideration given to traffic and highway safety.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a Transport Assessment to support the Site Allocations DPD. It will ensure that appropriate mitigation is agreed when any scheme comes forward before planning application can be approved. This matter has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	Highlights residential amenity impacts arising from the retail park. Whilst convenient, detrimental aspects include smells, lack of screening and litter. Most of Asda's planning applications have been achieved despite concerns / objections of neighbours.	None requested.	Comments noted and will be forwarded to the relevant officers to address.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	Many representations may be from outsiders rather than those from the immediate locality. This may act to the detriment of those who are not involved in those religion, education or other groups.	None stated.	The Council values all representations received from individuals and/organisations and give them equal weight. In particular, any information that will help improve the quality of the document is welcome.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	Use of local car park although not a public car park. Disappointing that request for measurement of emissions from vehicles was not considered.	None stated.	The Council has adequate and robust policies in the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD to control pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	No explanation as to why the lighting was increased at the roundabout at the entrance to Lion Retail Park. Report of light nuisance ignored. Lighting levels vary in different areas in Woking.	Request that correspondence receive replies and	The DPD is about future development on the allocated sites. Nevertheless, the Council has adequate and robust policies in the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD to control light pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					lighting in connection with developments be non-intrusive and in line with council policies.		
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	Request that planning for the area takes account of the needs of everyone, including non-religious families and self-employed people.	Request that you influence WBC and Surrey CC to achieve a situation where planning for the area takes account of the needs of everyone.	The DPD is intended to meet the development needs of all Sections of the community. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out to ensure that no particular group is disadvantaged as a result of the delivery of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
5	Marianne	Meinke	General	The lack of a cohesive group in our area should not be allowed to work to our disadvantage.	None stated.	The Council has a clear responsibility to plan to meet the needs of all Sections of the community whether or not there are cohesive groups to articulate their case. In this regard, the area will not be disadvantaged.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB9	The proposals include a new school but no new doctor or dentist. Local surgeries are full to capacity and additional residents will make the situation worse. This will impact the elderly the most. The Council has failed to make sufficient provision in its plans to ensure these services remain accessible for all.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) highlights that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB10	The proposals include a new school but no new doctor or dentist. Local surgeries are full to capacity and additional residents will make the situation worse. This will impact the elderly the most. The Council has failed to make sufficient provision in its plans to ensure these services remain accessible for all.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) highlights that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB11	The proposals include a new school but no new doctor or dentist. Local surgeries are full to capacity and additional residents will make the situation worse. This will impact the elderly the most. The Council has failed to make sufficient provision in its plans to ensure these services remain accessible for all.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) highlights that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB14	The proposals include a new school but no new doctor or dentist. Local surgeries are full to capacity and additional residents will make the situation worse. This will impact the elderly the most. The Council has failed to make sufficient	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				provision in its plans to ensure these services remain accessible for all.		<p>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>It should also be noted that the proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) highlights that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>	
670	T	Meinsma-Green	General	Asked to reconsider the plans based on the social and environmental responsibilities of Councillors. These plans will not safeguard local residents or show duty of care and put undue pressure on the aging population of the village. It is the Council's duty to safeguard Mayford Village's open character for future generations.	None stated.	<p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p> <p>The proposed allocations are not expected to have a negative impact on the health and well being of the aging population. Core Strategy Policy CS13 and the proposed allocation of elderly/specialist accommodation within the draft DPD will facilitate the delivery of specialist accommodation to meet local housing needs. In addition the Core Strategy encourages new and protects existing community facilities across the Borough.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character, social and environmental aspects of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB7	Further pitches would result in unwanted cold calling, fly tipping and other antisocial behaviour. This will put pressure on the community, Police and the Council. The impact of this on the residents has not been considered and therefore objects to the proposal.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm Traveller site is a functional established site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site and other relevant stakeholders to make sure that the expansion of the site does not have an adverse impact on the local area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	General	The proposed developments will have a significant negative impact on Mayford Village and surrounding area, including the village atmosphere and rural environment. The plans will erode the Green Belt and be irreversible.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB9	The need for more housing is driven by immigration by EU residents. However the proposals do not take into account for a reduction in total immigration over the next 4-10 years. The current government pledged to reduce EU and other immigration and these actions would reduce the demand for housing. This will result in empty houses where previously wildlife and openness could be enjoyed. With a likely change over the next 4 years, there is no requirement to safeguard and remove sites from the Green Belt now.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) which shows that the objectively assessed housing need of the borough was 594 dwellings per annum (of which 499 to be affordable). The SHMA 2015 indicates that the housing need in the borough is still significantly higher than the housing target of 292 dwellings per annum and therefore there is a clear need for housing in the borough. This is further supported by the Government commitment to the delivery of housing as emphasised in 'Fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation (2015).</p> <p>The response to the need to safeguard sites for between 2027 and 2040 has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB10	The need for more housing is driven by immigration by EU residents. However the proposals do not take into account for a reduction in total immigration over the next 4-10 years. The current government pledged to reduce EU and other immigration and these actions would reduce the demand for housing. This will result in empty houses where previously wildlife and openness could be enjoyed. With a likely change over the next 4 years, there is no requirement to safeguard and remove sites from the Green Belt now.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) which shows that the objectively assessed housing need of the borough was 594 dwellings per annum (of which 499 to be affordable). The SHMA 2015 indicates that the housing need in the borough is still significantly higher than the housing target of 292 dwellings per annum and therefore there is a clear need for housing in the borough. This is further supported by the Government commitment to the delivery of housing as emphasised in 'Fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation (2015).</p> <p>The response to the need to safeguard sites for between 2027 and 2040 has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB11	The need for more housing is driven by immigration by EU residents. However the proposals do not take into account for a reduction in total immigration over the next 4-10 years. The current government pledged to reduce EU and other immigration and these actions would reduce the demand for housing. This will result in empty houses where previously wildlife and openness could be enjoyed. With a likely change over the next 4 years, there is no requirement to safeguard and remove sites from the Green Belt now.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) which shows that the objectively assessed housing need of the borough was 594 dwellings per annum (of which 499 to be affordable). The SHMA 2015 indicates that the housing need in the borough is still significantly higher than the housing target of 292 dwellings per annum and therefore there is a clear need for housing in the borough. This is further supported by the Government commitment to the delivery of housing as emphasised in 'Fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation (2015).</p> <p>The response to the need to safeguard sites for between 2027 and 2040 has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
670	T	Meinsma-Green	GB14	The need for more housing is driven by immigration by EU residents. However the proposals do not take into account for a reduction in total immigration over the next 4-10 years. The current government pledged to reduce EU and other immigration and these actions would reduce the demand for housing. This will result in empty houses where previously wildlife and openness could be enjoyed. With a likely change over the next 4 years, there is no requirement to safeguard and remove sites from the Green Belt now.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) which shows that the objectively assessed housing need of the borough was 594 dwellings per annum (of which 499 to be affordable). The SHMA 2015 indicates that the housing need in the borough is still significantly higher than the housing target of 292 dwellings per annum and therefore there is a clear need for housing in the borough. This is further supported by the Government commitment to the delivery of housing as emphasised in 'Fixing the foundations: creating a more prosperous nation (2015).  The response to the need to safeguard sites for between 2027 and 2040 has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAAWB019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					pitches from the DPD	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.	
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB7	The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.  The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.  Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB11	The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on	None stated.	The Council has been clear that the land at Egley Road is allocated for a school and residential. The school now has the benefit of planning approval. The Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without undermining the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The school has the benefit of planning approval. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The school now has the benefit of planning approval. The Council has always been clear that the Egley Road site is allocated for a school and residential.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD		
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating that it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking (estimated using Google Maps timings). At peak hours actual travel time is over half an hour. Mayford has a poor road network that is heavily congested at peak times. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Development will exacerbate this.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic. Worplesdon rail station would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular matter has been addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular issues is also addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Domesday Book. 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.		of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB10	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. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. The 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 Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development including Travellers accommodation 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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the heritage assets of the area. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The Council does not believe that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. Also it is important to highlight that the ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. These two issues are comprehensively addressed in Sections 12 and 13 respectively in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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. In addition, it is used by walkers and is water-logged in the winter and after periods of rain.	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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						This 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.	
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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. 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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	General	The Council has not followed Government guidance to protect Green Belt land. Peter Brett Associates methodology is flawed, resulting in Mayford's inclusion for Green Belt release.	None stated.	The Council has following Government guidance in preparing the DPD. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The Green Belt boundary review report is a useful study to inform the Council's selection of preferred sites for allocation. The robustness of the approach taken to carry out the Green Belt boundary review is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10. The Council does not think that the study is flawed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB11	The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB8	The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB9	The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
227	Nicholas	Mendham	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. The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside the owners' immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations. No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in 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
227	Nicholas	Mendham	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.  The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	· Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.</li> </ul>	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	stated.	<p>of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	The owner/ occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The Green Belt Review states the site's low existing use value means it is likely to be economic viable at a low density.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	Contextual information: In October 2014 the government issues guidance to Council to protect the Green Belt ( <a href="http://www.gov.uk/government/news/councils-must-protect-our-precious-green-belt-land">www.gov.uk/government/news/councils-must-protect-our-precious-green-belt-land</a> ) but the Council appears not to be following this guidance. A Daily Telegraph article states that the Chancellor's sweeping reforms will make councils provide more new homes while protecting the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council acknowledged at the preparation of the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. The exceptional circumstances case to identify the Green Belt as the future direction of growth to release land for housing development between 2022 and 2027 has already been established through the in-principle policies in the Core Strategy to do so (see Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing provision and distribution). It was considered that the significant unmet need for housing and the necessity to meet the housing requirement over the plan period provides sufficient justification. Recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	Contextual information: In October 2014 the government issues guidance to Council to protect the Green Belt ( <a href="http://www.gov.uk/government/news/councils-must-protect-our-precious-green-belt-land">www.gov.uk/government/news/councils-must-protect-our-precious-green-belt-land</a> ) but the Council appears not to be following this guidance. A Daily Telegraph article states that the Chancellor's sweeping reforms will make councils provide more new homes while protecting the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council acknowledged at the preparation of the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. The exceptional circumstances case to identify the Green Belt as the future direction of growth to release land for housing development between 2022 and 2027 has already been established through the 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
				precious-green-belt-land) but the Council appears not to be following this guidance. A Daily Telegraph article states that the Chancellor's sweeping reforms will make councils provide more new homes while protecting the Green Belt.		principle policies in the Core Strategy to do so (see Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing provision and distribution). It was considered that the significant unmet need for housing and the necessity to meet the housing requirement over the plan period provides sufficient justification. Recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.	
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	Contextual information: In October 2014 the government issues guidance to Council to protect the Green Belt (www.gov.uk/government/news/councils-must-protect-our-precious-green-belt-land) but the Council appears not to be following this guidance. A Daily Telegraph article states that the Chancellor's sweeping reforms will make councils provide more new homes while protecting the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council acknowledged at the preparation of the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. The exceptional circumstances case to identify the Green Belt as the future direction of growth to release land for housing development between 2022 and 2027 has already been established through the in-principle policies in the Core Strategy to do so (see Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing provision and distribution). It was considered that the significant unmet need for housing and the necessity to meet the housing requirement over the plan period provides sufficient justification. Recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	Contextual information: In October 2014 the government issues guidance to Council to protect the Green Belt (www.gov.uk/government/news/councils-must-protect-our-precious-green-belt-land) but the Council appears not to be following this guidance. A Daily Telegraph article states that the Chancellor's sweeping reforms will make councils provide more new homes while protecting the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council acknowledged at the preparation of the Core Strategy that exceptional circumstances case ought to be made to release Green Belt land for housing. The exceptional circumstances case to identify the Green Belt as the future direction of growth to release land for housing development between 2022 and 2027 has already been established through the in-principle policies in the Core Strategy to do so (see Policies CS6: Green Belt and CS10: Housing provision and distribution). It was considered that the significant unmet need for housing and the necessity to meet the housing requirement over the plan period provides sufficient justification. Recent reviews of the SHLAA (2014) and the SHMA (2015) do not provide any significant new evidence that would lead the Council to change its policy approach. Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	Objects to proposed housing on the site, which will fill green space between Mayford and Hook Heath and Woking, turning Mayford/Hook Heath into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of the Green Belt. There appears to have been no consideration to preserving Mayford/Hook Heath as a separate settlement to Woking, nor impact on character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	Objects to proposed housing on the site, which will fill green space between Mayford and Hook Heath and Woking, turning Mayford/Hook Heath into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of the Green Belt. There appears to have been no consideration to preserving Mayford/Hook Heath as a separate settlement to Woking, nor impact on character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	Objects to proposed housing on the site, which will fill green space between Mayford and Hook Heath and Woking, turning Mayford/Hook Heath into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of the Green Belt. There appears to have been no consideration to preserving Mayford/Hook Heath as	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
				a separate settlement to Woking, nor impact on character.			
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	Objects to proposed housing on the site, which will fill green space between Mayford and Hook Heath and Woking, turning Mayford/Hook Heath into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of the Green Belt. There appears to have been no consideration to preserving Mayford/Hook Heath as a separate settlement to Woking, nor impact on character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	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 -	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development			
552	Christine	Mendham	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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected 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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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).	
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected 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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected 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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk. Quotes cost of similar sites. The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	The site's inclusion as an extended Traveller site is contrary to the Council's own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment. The site should not be included in the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	The proposed Green Belt boundary changes are based on the Green Belt Review. The methodology of this document which resulted in Mayford land being recommended for Green Belt release is flawed. The Council has not considered a number of other factors in its allocations (detailed below).	None stated.	The Council has considered a wide range of evidence in identifying sites for allocation in the DPD. This full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD whilst Section 8.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets this out in further detail.  The Council does not consider the methodology of the Green Belt boundary review to be flawed. This is set out in Section 10.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	The proposed Green Belt boundary changes are based on the Green Belt Review. The methodology of this document which resulted in Mayford land being recommended for Green Belt release is flawed. The Council has not considered a number of other factors in its allocations (detailed below).	None stated.	The Council has considered a wide range of evidence in identifying sites for allocation in the DPD. This full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD whilst Section 8.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets this out in further detail.  The Council does not consider the methodology of the Green Belt boundary review to be flawed. This is set out in Section 10.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	The proposed Green Belt boundary changes are based on the Green Belt Review. The methodology of this document which resulted in Mayford land being recommended for Green Belt release is flawed. The Council has not considered a number of other factors in its allocations (detailed below).	None stated.	The Council has considered a wide range of evidence in identifying sites for allocation in the DPD. This full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD whilst Section 8.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets this out in further detail.  The Council does not consider the methodology of the Green Belt boundary review to be flawed. This is set out in Section 10.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	The proposed Green Belt boundary changes are based on the Green Belt Review. The methodology of this document which resulted in Mayford land being recommended for Green Belt release is flawed. The Council has not considered a number of other factors in its allocations (detailed below).	None stated.	The Council has considered a wide range of evidence in identifying sites for allocation in the DPD. This full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD whilst Section 8.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets this out in further detail.  The Council does not consider the methodology of the Green Belt boundary review to be flawed. This is set out in Section 10.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice	The site should be removed from the DPD for	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
				guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	the reasons stated.	<p>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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	
552	Christine	Mendham	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
552	Christine	Mendham	GB8	There appears to have been no consideration to the impact on Mayford's/Hook Heath's infrastructure from the increased population, which will worsen existing traffic. There are no robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road, or roads without pavements and single lane railway bridges that cause congestion. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous due to increased traffic weaving around pedestrians on the road.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB9	There appears to have been no consideration to the impact on Mayford's/Hook Heath's infrastructure from the increased population, which will worsen existing traffic. There are no robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road, or roads without pavements and single lane railway bridges that cause congestion. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous due to increased traffic weaving around pedestrians on the road.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB10	There appears to have been no consideration to the impact on Mayford's/Hook Heath's infrastructure from the increased population, which will worsen existing traffic. There are no robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road, or roads without pavements and single lane railway bridges that cause congestion. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous due to increased traffic weaving around pedestrians on the road.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is 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
552	Christine	Mendham	GB11	There appears to have been no consideration to the impact on Mayford's/Hook Heath's infrastructure from the increased population, which will worsen existing traffic. There are no robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road, or roads without pavements and single lane railway bridges that cause congestion. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous due to increased traffic weaving around	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pedestrians on the road.			
686	William	Menzel	GB15	Not against more house building but in a smaller scale. A large scale development will ruin our towns.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) provides further detail on the site selection process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
686	William	Menzel	GB15	The proposals will change the character of the village and remove areas of natural space.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
686	William	Menzel	GB15	Question the competence and professional training of those involved in the document as it will have a significant impact on the area and its already congested roads. Need to expand the 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.  As set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has and will continue to work with its partners to publish specific strategies and programmes to provide further details on how some of the infrastructure will be delivered. This includes a Regulation 123 List with an indication of the priority infrastructure that the Council wishes to spend the Community Infrastructure Levy contributions and future updates to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
686	William	Menzel	GB15	Horrified by proposals in West Byfleet and Byfleet. There is a lot of traffic on Parvis Road and a significant amount of noise pollution from it. The proposals will add to this.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.  The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.  The Development Management Policies DPD contains policy to ensure that development proposals will not have a significant impact on noise pollution. This will be addressed at the detailed planning application stage to determine the baseline level and the potential increase in noise pollution as well as set out suitable mitigation measures.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
937	Sarah	Menzies	GB13	Pyrford's character comes from its surrounding green areas. There is already a deficit of green areas to walk dogs and the loss of these sites will lead to overcrowding of the remaining areas.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.  The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.  In order to facilitate the delivery of the Core Strategy the Council has prepared the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is fully committed to preparing this document in order to bring forward suitable and sustainable sites for the Borough's development needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
937	Sarah	Menzies	GB13	Pyrford's character comes from its surrounding green areas. There is already a deficit of green areas to walk dogs and the loss of these sites will lead to overcrowding of the remaining areas.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p> <p>In order to facilitate the delivery of the Core Strategy the Council has prepared the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is fully committed to preparing this document in order to bring forward suitable and sustainable sites for the Borough's development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
937	Sarah	Menzies	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The narrow roads will be over pressurised. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding concerns about 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 representation regarding schools has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
937	Sarah	Menzies	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The narrow roads will be over pressurised. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding concerns about 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 representation regarding schools has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1682	J and T	Meredith	General	The site is incorrectly classified as Green Belt given its previous residential land use. It is subject of fly-tipping and a new dwelling would solve this issue. We support the development of this site.	None stated.	Support noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	<p>Traveller sites should be close to schools and services as set out in the Core Strategy and SHLAA, this site is not.</p> <p>There is a lack of supporting infrastructure in the area. The development of a communal building for Travellers will not positively enhance the environment and openness of the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a through assessment against all reasonable and deliverable alternatives, this site is considered to be suitable for additional Traveller pitches on what is an existing Traveller site.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	None stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.			of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI and Hoe Stream SNCI and would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites that form the boundary of the land.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	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.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.		well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.			of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.  The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.  As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.			of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.  No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly decontaminated.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the 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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'.	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	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
				Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.		<p>Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB9	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	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
723	Jane	Messenger	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
144	Garry	Middleton	UA32	Paragraph 1 'to seek qualitative improvement of housing through regeneration' is pointless as no report has been done on the condition of the existing housing stock, so to suggest that hundred of properties should be demolished just for the sake of it is just silly.	Development should be restricted to the area that actually looks in need of attention, namely the area surrounding the shops in Dartmouth Avenue. I have no objection to the athletics track being moved if a suitable place can be found for it. Your own objectives mention that the proposed	The Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as a Priority Place where priority investment will be targeted to address the pockets of deprivation identified in the area. The proposed allocation UA32 will contribute significantly towards achieving this goal. The scale of the allocation will derive maximum benefits to the community. The strategic policy context for developing the site and consequently for its allocation in the Site Allocations DPD is Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The allocation includes a set of key requirement to ensure the sustainable development of the allocated site. One of the key requirements to be met by any proposal to develop the site is an enhancement of the open space provision in the area. The Local Planning Authority will work closely with the applicant of any scheme that comes forward to make sure that the policy aspirations for the site and the key requirement are reflected in the scheme that comes forward for determination. It is important to highlight that planning application has been submitted for the development of the site through the development management process. The application is yet to be determined. The Council acknowledges the potential for the disruption of people's lives. It will take upmost care to ensure that there is a sensitive decanting strategy that will help minimise any disruption to the lives of residents who live, work and visit 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
					development is of a scale 'unprecedented in the Borough', and would inevitably mean that Sheerwater would lose much of its open space, gardens and associated wildlife (e.g. bats and slow-worms), and suffer problems with increased traffic and sewerage. The forced expulsion of residents for what is basically a grand exercise in the manipulation of statistics is just horrifying. Anyone classed as 'deprived' now will remain deprived – they just won't show up in the figures!		
144	Garry	Middleton	UA32	Paragraph 4 'short-term employment would be generated during a phased construction period through local labour agreements' - as 'local' doesn't mean exclusively Sheerwater, benefits for residents would be negligible, particularly when there are vacant sites in adjacent business parks. What percentage of jobs in the ASDA superstore have been taken by Sheerwater residents?	Development should be restricted to the area that actually looks in need of attention, namely the area surrounding the shops in Dartmouth Avenue. I have no objection to the athletics track being moved if a suitable place can be found for it. Your	The Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as a Priority Place where priority investment will be targeted to address the pockets of deprivation identified in the area. The proposed allocation UA32 will contribute significantly towards achieving this goal. The strategic policy context for developing the site and consequently for its allocation in the Site Allocations DPD is Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The allocation includes a set of key requirements to ensure the sustainable development of the allocated site. One of the key requirements to be met by any proposal to develop the site is an enhancement of the open space provision in the area. The Local Planning Authority will work closely with the applicant of any scheme that comes forward to make sure that the policy aspirations for the site and the key requirements are reflected in the scheme that comes forward for determination. It is important to highlight that planning application has been submitted for the development of the site through the development management process. The application is yet to be determined. The development of the site will enhance the Local Centre to provide day to day needs for local residents. It is envisaged that the development of the site will create and support local jobs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					own objectives mention that the proposed development is of a scale 'unprecedented in the Borough', and would inevitably mean that Sheerwater would lose much of its open space, gardens and associated wildlife (e.g. bats and slow-worms), and suffer problems with increased traffic and sewerage. The forced expulsion of residents for what is basically a grand exercise in the manipulation of statistics is just horrifying. Anyone classed as 'deprived' now will remain deprived – they just won't show up in the figures!		
144	Garry	Middleton	UA32	Paragraph 5 'The site is located within 20-30 minutes walk of Woking Railway Station' - It is extremely unlikely that the average person could walk to Woking Station in as little time as 20 minutes! What is the walking distance?	Development should be restricted to the area that actually looks in need of attention, namely the area surrounding the shops in Dartmouth Avenue. I have no objection to the athletics track being moved if a	The Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as a Priority Place where priority investment will be targeted to address the pockets of deprivation identified in the area. The proposed allocation UA32 will contribute significantly towards achieving this goal. The strategic policy context for developing the site and consequently for its allocation in the Site Allocations DPD is Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The allocation includes a set of key requirement to ensure the sustainable development of the allocated site. One of the key requirements to be met by any proposal to develop the site is an enhancement of the open space provision in the area. The Local Planning Authority will work closely with the applicant of any scheme that comes forward to make sure that the policy aspirations for the site and the key requirement are reflected in the scheme that comes forward for determination. It is important to highlight that planning application has been submitted for the development of the site through the development management process. The application is yet to be determined. The development of the site will enhance the Local Centre to provide day to day needs for local residents. It is envisaged that the development of the site will create and support local jobs.	No further modification is 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>suitable place can be found for it. Your own objectives mention that the proposed development is of a scale 'unprecedented in the Borough', and would inevitably mean that Sheerwater would lose much of its open space, gardens and associated wildlife (e.g. bats and slow-worms), and suffer problems with increased traffic and sewerage. The forced expulsion of residents for what is basically a grand exercise in the manipulation of statistics is just horrifying. Anyone classed as 'deprived' now will remain deprived – they just won't show up in the figures!</p>		
144	Garry	Middleton	UA32	Paragraph 6 'Encourage the re-use of existing buildings where possible' - Commendable, but where are the examples? How does this square with the policy of large-scale demolition?	<p>Development should be restricted to the area that actually looks in need of attention, namely the area surrounding the shops in Dartmouth Avenue. I have no objection to</p>	<p>The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as a Priority Place where priority investment will be targeted to address the pockets of deprivation identified in the area. The proposed allocation UA32 will contribute significantly towards achieving this goal. The strategic policy context for developing the site and consequently for its allocation in the Site Allocations DPD is Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The allocation includes a set of key requirements to ensure the sustainable development of the allocated site. One of the key requirements to be met by any proposal to develop the site is an enhancement of the open space provision in the area. The Local Planning Authority will work closely with the applicant of any scheme that comes forward to make sure that the policy aspirations for the site and the key requirement are reflected in the scheme that comes forward for determination. It is important to highlight that planning application has been submitted for the development of the site through the development management process. The application is yet to be determined. The development of the site will enhance the Local Centre to provide day to day needs for local residents. It is envisaged that the development of the site will create and support local jobs.</p>	No further modification is 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 athletics track being moved if a suitable place can be found for it. Your own objectives mention that the proposed development is of a scale 'unprecedented in the Borough', and would inevitably mean that Sheerwater would lose much of its open space, gardens and associated wildlife (e.g. bats and slow-worms), and suffer problems with increased traffic and sewerage. The forced expulsion of residents for what is basically a grand exercise in the manipulation of statistics is just horrifying. Anyone classed as 'deprived' now will remain deprived – they just won't show up in the figures!		
144	Garry	Middleton	UA32	Paragraph 11 'Development of the site could potentially lead to an increase in hard-landscaping' - It's not potential, development on this scale will lead to an increase in hard-landscaping and associated water run-off, as garden land will be substantially reduced.	Development should be restricted to the area that actually looks in need of attention, namely the area surrounding the shops in	The Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as a Priority Place where priority investment will be targeted to address the pockets of deprivation identified in the area. The proposed allocation UA32 will contribute significantly towards achieving this goal. The strategic policy context for developing the site and consequently for its allocation in the Site Allocations DPD is Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The allocation includes a set of key requirement to ensure the sustainable development of the allocated site. One of the key requirements to be met by any proposal to develop the site is an enhancement of the open space provision in the area. The Local Planning Authority will work closely with the applicant of any scheme that comes forward to make sure that the policy aspirations for the site and the key requirement are reflected in the scheme that comes forward for determination. It is important to highlight that planning application has been submitted for the development of the site through the development management process. The application is yet to be determined. The development of the site will enhance the Local Centre to provide day to day needs for local residents. It is envisaged that	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Dartmouth Avenue. I have no objection to the athletics track being moved if a suitable place can be found for it. Your own objectives mention that the proposed development is of a scale 'unprecedented in the Borough', and would inevitably mean that Sheerwater would lose much of its open space, gardens and associated wildlife (e.g. bats and slow-worms), and suffer problems with increased traffic and sewerage. The forced expulsion of residents for what is basically a grand exercise in the manipulation of statistics is just horrifying. Anyone classed as 'deprived' now will remain deprived – they just won't show up in the figures!	the development of the site will create and support local jobs.	
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB7	Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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	No further modification is 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>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>	
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB7	Objects to increasing the number of pitches on the site. Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB8	<p>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.</p> <p>Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. Guildford Council are bringing the northern Guildford boundary closer to Woking and even WBC's consultation plan states the boundaries will be less than guidelines for maintenance of Green Belt.</p> <p>The proposals will also merge Mayford and Hook Heath.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>Any proposed developments in adjacent Boroughs will be subject to the same national Green Belt policies as Woking Borough Council. Therefore any development proposed to take place in northern Guildford should not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford which is a clear purpose of Green Belt. The Council is working with the neighbouring authorities in order to address the strategic issues of the area. This will be set out in a Duty to Cooperate Statement.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB9	<p>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.</p> <p>Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. Guildford Council are bringing the northern Guildford boundary closer to Woking and even WBC's consultation plan states the boundaries will be less than guidelines for maintenance of Green Belt.</p> <p>The proposals will also merge Mayford and Hook Heath.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>Any proposed developments in adjacent Boroughs will be subject to the same national Green Belt policies as Woking Borough Council. Therefore any development proposed to take place in northern Guildford should not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford which is a clear purpose of Green Belt. The Council is working with the neighbouring authorities in order to address the strategic issues of the area. This will be set out in a Duty to Cooperate Statement.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB10	<p>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.</p> <p>Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. Guildford Council are bringing the northern Guildford boundary closer to Woking and even WBC's consultation plan states the boundaries will be less than guidelines for maintenance of Green Belt.</p> <p>The proposals will also merge Mayford and Hook Heath.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>Any proposed developments in adjacent Boroughs will be subject to the same national Green Belt policies as Woking Borough Council. Therefore any development proposed to take place in northern Guildford should not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford which is a clear purpose of Green Belt. The Council is working with the neighbouring authorities in order to address the strategic issues of the area. This will be set out in a Duty to Cooperate Statement.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB11	<p>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.</p> <p>Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. Guildford Council are bringing the northern Guildford boundary closer to Woking and even WBC's consultation plan states the boundaries will be less than guidelines for maintenance of Green Belt.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>Any proposed developments in adjacent Boroughs will be subject to the same national Green Belt policies as Woking Borough Council. Therefore any development proposed to take place in northern Guildford should not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford which is a clear purpose of Green Belt. The Council is working with the neighbouring authorities in order to address the strategic issues of the area. This will be set out in a Duty to Cooperate Statement.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				The proposals will also merge Mayford and Hook Heath.			
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB14	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. Guildford Council are bringing the northern Guildford boundary closer to Woking and even WBC's consultation plan states the boundaries will be less than guidelines for maintenance of Green Belt. The proposals will also merge Mayford and Hook Heath.	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB8	Areas of Mayford are in the flood plain. Sewage drains have leaked near the Hoe Stream from the main road.	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB9	Areas of Mayford are in the flood plain. Sewage drains have leaked near the Hoe Stream from the main road.	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB10	Areas of Mayford are in the flood plain. Sewage drains have leaked near the Hoe Stream from the main road.	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB11	Areas of Mayford are in the flood plain. Sewage drains have leaked near the Hoe Stream from the main road.	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB14	Areas of Mayford are in the flood plain. Sewage drains have leaked near the Hoe Stream from the main road.	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB14	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB7	Mayford does not have access to local amenities therefore it is not suitable for Traveller sites.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a through assessment against all reasonable and deliverable alternatives, this site is considered to be suitable for additional Traveller pitches on what is an existing Traveller site.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB8	The Green Belt supports wildlife and provides animal corridors. Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB9	The Green Belt supports wildlife and provides animal corridors. Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB10	The Green Belt supports wildlife and provides animal corridors. Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB11	The Green Belt supports wildlife and provides animal corridors. Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB14	The Green Belt supports wildlife and provides animal corridors. Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation 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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</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
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1017	T.J.	Milbourn	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	No consideration to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking or impact on the character of the Village. No justification for assertion that Mayford has no historic value.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has given consideration to preserving the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. The Green Belt boundary review assessed sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which include preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The Council is satisfied that the proposal will not undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or significantly affect it character. This particular issues are addressed in detail in Sections 12, 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	No consideration to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking or impact on the character of the Village. No justification for assertion that Mayford has no historic value.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has given consideration to preserving the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. The Green Belt boundary review assessed sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which include preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The Council is satisfied that the proposal will not undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or significantly affect it character. This particular issues are addressed in detail in Sections 12, 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	No consideration to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking or impact on the character of the Village. No justification for assertion that Mayford has no historic value.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has given consideration to preserving the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. The Green Belt boundary review assessed sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which include preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The Council is satisfied that the proposal will not undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or significantly affect it character. This particular issues are addressed in detail in Sections 12, 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	Mayford has two SSSIs (under consideration for inclusion in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas and buffer zone). The area is rich in habitat for a wide range of wildlife (species are named). Animals corridors are needed for these to move around in search of food and shelter and reach other suitable areas. Removing Green Belt to develop these significant open spaces will have a very detrimental effect on wildlife, as well as visually and through increased noise and air pollution.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	Mayford has two SSSIs (under consideration for inclusion in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas and buffer zone). The area is rich in habitat for a wide range of wildlife (species are named). Animals corridors are needed for these to move around in search of food and shelter and reach other suitable areas. Removing Green Belt to develop these significant open spaces will have a very detrimental effect on wildlife, as well as visually and through increased noise and air pollution.	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 Smarts Heath as SPA, it is not designated and the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, The Council attaches significant importance to the protection of SSSIs and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to achieve this objective. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	Mayford has two SSSIs (under consideration for inclusion in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas and buffer zone). The area is rich in habitat for a wide range of wildlife (species are named). Animals corridors are needed for these to move around in search of food and shelter and reach other suitable areas. Removing Green Belt to develop these significant open spaces will have a very detrimental effect on wildlife, as well as visually and through increased noise and air pollution.	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 Smarts Heath as SPA, the 400 exclusion zone cannot apply because it is not designated. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of SSSI and has robust policies such as Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy to help achieve that.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. When any local major trunk roads (M3, M25, A3) suffer delays these increase traffic volumes on the A320. Development will increase local traffic. Local roads cannot provide the extra capacity required to service large residential and commercial increases in density	Please reconsider your plans	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The Council is satisfied that satisfactory access arrangement can be achieved for all the sites and these are specified in some of the key requirements of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. When any local major trunk roads (M3, M25, A3) suffer delays these increase traffic volumes on the A320. Development will increase local traffic. Local roads cannot provide the extra capacity required to service large residential and commercial increases in density	Please reconsider your plans	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. When any local major trunk roads (M3, M25, A3) suffer delays these increase traffic volumes on the A320. Development will increase local traffic. Local roads cannot provide the extra capacity required to service large residential and commercial increases in density	Please reconsider your plans	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. When any local major trunk roads (M3, M25, A3) suffer delays these increase traffic volumes on the A320. Development will increase local traffic. Local roads cannot provide the extra capacity required to service large residential and commercial increases in density	Please reconsider your plans	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB9	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. When any local major trunk roads (M3, M25, A3) suffer delays these increase traffic volumes on the A320. Development will increase local traffic. Local roads cannot provide the extra capacity required to service large residential and commercial increases in density	Please reconsider your plans	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB7	Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	Please reconsider your plans	The 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	<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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	<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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	<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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of	Please reconsider your plans	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.		<p>Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. 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>	
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB9	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	<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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	Do not feel the site is suitable for further development, extensive sports, leisure facilities and housing. It cannot support the extra infrastructure required, specifically provision for increased traffic on the A320 and surrounds.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The Egley Road site already has planning permission for a school and a leisure centre. Part of the site is also allocated for residential development, which the traffic impacts will be have to be addressed. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB7	A significant increase in pitches would reduce visual amenity of and risk the adjoining SSSI.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	I strongly object to the removal of Green Belt from GB10, GB11 and GB14. Green Belt is to check urban sprawl, prevent merging of neighbouring towns. Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and merging Mayford with Hook Heath. Proposals in Guildford Borough will also have an impact. Green Belt land in Mayford is incorrectly classified only as "important" in the Green Belt Review.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	I strongly object to the removal of Green Belt from GB10, GB11 and GB14. Green Belt is to check urban sprawl, prevent merging of neighbouring towns. Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and merging Mayford with Hook Heath. Proposals in Guildford Borough will also have an impact. Green Belt land in Mayford is incorrectly classified only as "important" in the Green Belt Review.	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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	I strongly object to the removal of Green Belt from GB10, GB11 and GB14. Green Belt is to check urban sprawl, prevent merging of neighbouring towns. Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and merging Mayford with Hook Heath. Proposals in Guildford Borough will also have an impact. Green Belt land in Mayford is incorrectly classified only as "important" in the Green Belt Review.	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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB9	Very strongly object to removing Green Belt status from this land. This site is one of only a handful of local amenities, providing a garden shop, popular café, an attractive environment in easy reach for young families and those who prefer not to have to travel into Woking.	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. In addition to the justification set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the promoters of the site are positive that the site would be available for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	I am dubious about assurances regarding flood risk. Despite local works there has been significant flooding, including sewage breakout in the low-lying area alongside the A320 south by the Mayford roundabout.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB7	I am very concerned about the proposals' impact on Mayford. I object to proposed increase in Traveller Pitches. I object to the proposed increase in Traveller pitches. Whilst in principle I do not object to a small increase, the proposal is for twelve to fifteen. Traveller sites should be located with access to schools, facilities, jobs, shops, etc.; Mayford has few of these.	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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB9	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council believes that access to the site can be achieved as part of the site specific requirements to be agreed. 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council believes that access to the site can be achieved as part of the site specific requirements to be agreed. 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council believes that access to the site can be achieved as part of the site specific requirements to be agreed. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council believes that access to the site can be achieved as part of the site specific requirements to be agreed. 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB9	Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council believes that access to the site can be achieved as part of the site specific requirements to be agreed. 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2	
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	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. Sections 1, 2, 3. The general approach 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB9	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The general approach 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	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 general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	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 general approach 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>that the 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>	
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	I object to loss of Green Belt status from this land. As a parent I recognise the urgent need for another secondary school (under 'exceptional circumstances').	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB10	Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	Please reconsider your plans	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB11	Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	Please reconsider your plans	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB14	Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	Please reconsider your plans	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB8	Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	Please reconsider your plans	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1079	C.G.	Milbourn	GB9	Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	Please reconsider your plans	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB10	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB11	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB14	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB8	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB9	Concerned for flood risk. Local water and sewage systems could not cope, endangering public health.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB10	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. Development will increase local traffic. Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents. Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	None stated.	The general approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB11	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. Development will increase local traffic. Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents. Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	None stated.	The general approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB14	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. Development will increase local traffic. Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents. Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is	None stated.	The general approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.		planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB8	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. Development will increase local traffic. Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents. Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	None stated.	The general approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB9	Access to Mayford is restricted. Roads are congested at peak times. Development will increase local traffic. Access to the parcels of land is limited, in particular GB14 accessing onto Hook Hill Lane would result in congestion and accidents. Bus services are limited but presumably would increase if demand were to grow. Train services are not able to cope with greater local demand and are remote from the developments so commuters will drive. The car park is already overflowing and Prey Heath Road lacks footpaths.	None stated.	The general approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB7	Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB10	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the	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
				Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.		<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. 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>	
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB11	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. 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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB14	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. 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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB8	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is 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. 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.	
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB9	Mayford has insufficient amenities. The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure. Servicing of any new facilities would increase existing traffic congestion. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. 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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB7	A significant increase in pitches would reduce visual amenity of and risk the adjoining SSSI.	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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB10	I strongly object to the removal of Green Belt from GB10, GB11 and GB14. Green Belt is to check urban sprawl, prevent merging of neighbouring towns. Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and merging Mayford with Hook Heath. Proposals in Guildford Borough will also have an impact. Green Belt land in Mayford is incorrectly classified only as "important" in the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a 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 and Hood Heath is protected by the Policies of the Core Strategy and the Hood Heath Neighbourhood Plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB11	I strongly object to the removal of Green Belt from GB10, GB11 and GB14. Green Belt is to check urban sprawl, prevent merging of neighbouring towns. Housing will fill in	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and merging Mayford with Hook Heath. Proposals in Guildford Borough will also have an impact. Green Belt land in Mayford is incorrectly classified only as “important” in the Green Belt Review.		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.	
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB14	I strongly object to the removal of Green Belt from GB10, GB11 and GB14. Green Belt is to check urban sprawl, prevent merging of neighbouring towns. Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and merging Mayford with Hook Heath. Proposals in Guildford Borough will also have an impact. Green Belt land in Mayford is incorrectly classified only as “important” in the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It 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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB9	Very strongly object to removing Green Belt status from this land. This site is one of only a handful of local amenities, providing a garden shop, popular café, an attractive environment in easy reach for young families and those who prefer not to have to travel into Woking.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In addition to the justification set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is satisfied that the site will be available to come forward for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB8	I am dubious about assurances regarding flood risk. Despite local works there has been significant flooding, including sewage breakout in the low-lying area alongside the A320 south by the Mayford roundabout.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB7	I object to the proposed increase in Traveller pitches. Whilst in principle I do not object to a small increase, the proposal is for twelve to fifteen. Traveller sites should be located with access to schools, facilities, jobs, shops, etc.; Mayford has few of these.	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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB10	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release 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	
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB8	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	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 , 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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB9	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	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 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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB11	I very strongly object to the proposed housing and removal of Green Belt status from sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. The infrastructure in Mayford cannot support such developments.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB14	I strongly object to the removal of Green Belt from GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. Green Belt is to check urban sprawl, prevent merging of neighbouring towns. Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and merging Mayford with Hook Heath. Proposals in Guildford Borough will also have an impact. Green Belt land in Mayford is incorrectly classified only as “important” in the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</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
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB8	I recognise the urgent need for another secondary school (under 'exceptional circumstances') but do not feel the site is suitable for further development, for extensive proposed sports and leisure facilities and housing.	None stated.	The school and leisure centre application now has planning permission. The justification for the residential development of the site is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1199	E.	Milbourn	GB8	It cannot support the extra infrastructure required, specifically provision for increased traffic on the A320 and surrounds.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book and has beautiful historic buildings and strong history. There is no justification to dismiss the consideration of sites against GB	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'.		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	
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book and has beautiful historic buildings and strong history. There is no justification to dismiss the consideration of sites against GB purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'.	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book and has beautiful historic buildings and strong history. There is no justification to dismiss the consideration of sites against GB purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'.	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	Mayford has two SSSI which are under consideration for inclusion in the TBH SPA. The area is rich in wildlife and a habitat for various species including buzzard, red kites and sparrowhawks, woodpeckers, nuthatches, yellow wagtails, snipe, kingfishers, nightjar, deer, badgers, foxes. Removing GB designation and developing significant areas of open space will threaten local wildlife.  It would also impact on air and noise pollution.	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.  The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution and requires development to be built to high design standards.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	Mayford has two SSSI which are under consideration for inclusion in the TBH SPA. The area is rich in wildlife and a habitat for various species including buzzard, red kites and sparrowhawks, woodpeckers, nuthatches, yellow wagtails, snipe, kingfishers, nightjar, deer, badgers, foxes. Removing GB designation and developing significant areas of open space will threaten local wildlife.  It would also impact on air and noise pollution.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution and requires development to be built to high design standards.	
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	<p>Mayford has two SSSI which are under consideration for inclusion in the TBH SPA. The area is rich in wildlife and a habitat for various species including buzzard, red kites and sparrowhawks, woodpeckers, nuthatches, yellow wagtails, snipe, kingfishers, nightjar, deer, badgers, foxes. Removing GB designation and developing significant areas of open space will threaten local wildlife.</p> <p>It would also impact on air and noise pollution.</p>	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution and requires development to be built to high design standards.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	No evidence provided to demonstrate that Woking has exhausted Brownfield sites	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	No evidence provided to demonstrate that Woking has exhausted Brownfield sites	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	No evidence provided to demonstrate that Woking has exhausted Brownfield sites	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB8	<p>Access around Mayford is restricted. The main road between Woking and Guildford is routinely congested. The GBBR suggests that it takes ten minutes between Mayford and Woking. This is inaccurate and in reality can take more than half an hour.</p> <p>Issues on the major trunk roads (M3,M25 and A3), road works have a knock on effect on local roads creating more congestion and bad driving habits e.g. rat-running. The proposals for the area will exacerbate existing problems and create gridlock on roads.</p> <p>The existing bus service is limited although may improve with increase demand.</p> <p>Worplesdon Station can not cope with the higher demand.</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 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB9	<p>Access around Mayford is restricted. The main road between Woking and Guildford is routinely congested. The GBBR suggests that it takes ten minutes between Mayford and Woking. This is inaccurate and in reality can take more than half an hour.</p> <p>Issues on the major trunk roads (M3,M25 and A3), road works have a knock on effect on local roads creating more congestion and bad driving habits e.g. rat-running. The proposals for the area will exacerbate existing problems and create gridlock on roads.</p> <p>The existing bus service is limited although may improve with increase demand.</p> <p>Worplesdon Station can not cope with the higher demand.</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 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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	<p>Access around Mayford is restricted. The main road between Woking and Guildford is routinely congested. The GBBR suggests that it takes ten minutes between Mayford and Woking. This is inaccurate and in reality can take more than half an hour.</p> <p>Issues on the major trunk roads (M3,M25 and A3), road works have a knock on effect on local roads creating more congestion and bad driving habits e.g. rat-running. The proposals for the area will exacerbate existing problems and create gridlock on roads.</p> <p>The existing bus service is limited although may improve with increase demand.</p> <p>Worplesdon Station can not cope with the higher demand.</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 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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	<p>Access around Mayford is restricted. The main road between Woking and Guildford is routinely congested. The GBBR suggests that it takes ten minutes between Mayford and Woking. This is inaccurate and in reality can take more than half an hour.</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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Issues on the major trunk roads (M3,M25 and A3), road works have a knock on effect on local roads creating more congestion and bad driving habits e.g. rat-running. The proposals for the area will exacerbate existing problems and create gridlock on roads. The existing bus service is limited although may improve with increase demand. Worplesdon Station can not cope with the higher demand.		<p>These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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>	
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	Access around Mayford is restricted. The main road between Woking and Guildford is routinely congested. The GBBR suggests that it takes ten minutes between Mayford and Woking. This is inaccurate and in reality can take more than half an hour. Issues on the major trunk roads (M3,M25 and A3), road works have a knock on effect on local roads creating more congestion and bad driving habits e.g. rat-running. The proposals for the area will exacerbate existing problems and create gridlock on roads. The existing bus service is limited although may improve with increase demand. Worplesdon Station can not cope with the higher demand.	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 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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB8	There are insufficient amenities in Mayford. The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre- however there is only a Post Office, barbers, garden centre and two pubs. The school is at capacity, there is no local doctor or dentist. Any attempt to create new services would create additional traffic	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB9	There are insufficient amenities in Mayford. The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre- however there is only a Post Office, barbers, garden	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				centre and two pubs. The school is at capacity, there is no local doctor or dentist. Any attempt to create new services would create additional traffic		<p>Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	There are insufficient amenities in Mayford. The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre- however there is only a Post Office, barbers, garden centre and two pubs. The school is at capacity, there is no local doctor or dentist. Any attempt to create new services would create additional traffic	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	There are insufficient amenities in Mayford. The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre- however there is only a Post Office, barbers, garden centre and two pubs. The school is at capacity, there is no local doctor or dentist. Any attempt to create new services would create additional traffic	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	There are insufficient amenities in Mayford. The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre- however there is only a Post Office, barbers, garden centre and two pubs. The school is at capacity, there is no local doctor or dentist. Any attempt to create new services would create additional traffic	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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB8	Local resident. Recognises the need for more schools but does not consider the site suitable. Particular concerns about the Sports and Leisure Centre and housing. The site can not support the extra infrastructure in particular the increase in traffic on surrounding roads and impact on flooding. Despite improvement works to relieve flooding over the years, there is still significant flooding issues in the area including sewage breakout.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission.</p> <p>As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p> <p>The other issues raised regarding flooding, traffic, sewer capacity were 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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB9	Objects to the removal of GB land on this site. The site is one of only a handful of amenities in the area, it is a garden shop, café and provides an attractive environment.	None stated.	<p>Although the Garden Centre may be valued by the community, it is not a defined community facility and cannot be awarded the same protection.</p> <p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB7	<p>Mayford resident, Objects to a significant increase of Traveller pitches on the site.</p> <p>Traveller sites should be located close to local facilities and amenities.</p> <p>A significant increase in Traveller pitches will reduce the visual amenity of the area and increase risk to the adjoining SSSI</p> <p>Successive planning inspectors have refused planning permission on the site as it would reduce the openness of the GB</p>	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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> <p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB8	Objects to the proposed development sites and removal of GB status in Mayford. Particular concerns about flood risk of sites. The sewerage system cannot cope with the extra 500-600 homes and school. Recent sewage works on Vicarage Road to increase sewage capacity suggests the system is at capacity. Public health will be put at risk if sewage breakouts reoccur.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB9	Objects to the proposed development sites and removal of GB status in Mayford. Particular concerns about flood risk of sites. The sewerage system cannot cope with the extra 500-600 homes and school. Recent sewage works on Vicarage Road to increase sewage capacity suggests the system is at capacity. Public health will be put at risk if sewage breakouts reoccur.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	Objects to the proposed development sites and removal of GB status in Mayford. Particular concerns about flood risk of sites. The sewerage system cannot cope with the extra 500-600 homes and school. Recent sewage works on Vicarage Road to increase sewage capacity suggests the system is at capacity. Public health will be put at risk if sewage breakouts reoccur.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	Objects to the proposed development sites and removal of GB status in Mayford. Particular concerns about flood risk of sites. The sewerage system cannot cope with the extra 500-600 homes and school. Recent sewage works on Vicarage Road to increase sewage capacity suggests the system is at capacity. Public health will be put at risk if sewage breakouts reoccur.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	Objects to the proposed development sites and removal of GB status in Mayford. Particular concerns about flood risk of sites. The sewerage system cannot cope with the extra 500-600 homes and school. Recent sewage works on Vicarage Road to increase sewage capacity suggests the system is at capacity. Public health will be put at risk if sewage breakouts reoccur.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	The purpose of GB is to check urban sprawl and prevent the merging of neighbouring towns. The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. GB land is fundamental to the physical separation of Mayford, this is incorrectly classified as only "important" in the GBBR.			
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	The purpose of GB is to check urban sprawl and prevent the merging of neighbouring towns. The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. GB land is fundamental to the physical separation of Mayford, this is incorrectly classified as only "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 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	The purpose of GB is to check urban sprawl and prevent the merging of neighbouring towns. The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. GB land is fundamental to the physical separation of Mayford, this is incorrectly classified as only "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 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB9	Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the local environment and community.	None stated.	Objection noted.  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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB10	Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the local environment and community.	None stated.	Objection noted.  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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB11	Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the local environment and community.	None stated.	Objection noted.  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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB14	Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the local environment and community.	None stated.	Objection noted.  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
1229	J.R.	Milbourn	GB8	Reconsider plans. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the local environment and community.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the various technical studies and assessments undertaken have carefully considered the impacts of the proposed allocations and therefore sets out requirements for further consideration and mitigation measures to address the impacts. Proposals will also have to take into account all relevant development plan policies at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
912	Ruth	Miles	GB8	Strongly object to increasing the number of pitches on site.	None stated.	Noted. This 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
912	Ruth	Miles	GB9	Strongly object to housing development.	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
912	Ruth	Miles	GB10	Strongly object to housing development.	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
912	Ruth	Miles	GB11	Strongly object to housing development.	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
912	Ruth	Miles	GB8	Strongly object to the proposal.	None stated.	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
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB13	Deeply concerned about the proposals. Chose to live in Pyrford due to the peaceful setting with local amenities close at hand, where there is clean air and easy access to the countryside. Has seen urban sprawl over 25 years in Bournemouth, where separate small communities have merged into one indistinguishable mass of unattractive housing, making you feel like battery hens in a cage, where the road and school infrastructure began to break down due to strain.	None stated.	Comments noted. The concerns raised are addressed in terms of Woking Borough in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 3.0 (paragraph 3.8). The Council values the Borough's countryside and green space, as outlined in Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS17. It will continue to protect the majority of its countryside, with only 3.46% proposed to be removed through the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB12	Deeply concerned about the proposals. Chose to live in Pyrford due to the peaceful setting with local amenities close at hand, where there is clean air and easy access to the countryside. Has seen urban sprawl over 25 years in Bournemouth, where separate small communities have merged into one indistinguishable mass of unattractive housing, making you feel like battery hens in a cage, where the road and school infrastructure began to break down due to strain.	None stated.	Comments noted. The concerns raised are addressed in terms of Woking Borough in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 3.0 (paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.8) and 24.0. The Council values the Borough's countryside and green space, as outlined in Core Strategy Policies CS6 and CS17. It will continue to protect the majority of its countryside, with only 3.46% proposed to be removed through the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB12	Terrified Woking Council will make the same mistakes [as Bournemouth]. Aware of Government housing requirements but the housing proposals in Pyrford would cause irreparable damage to the local community.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 23.0, 21.0, 19.0 and Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB13	Terrified Woking Council will make the same mistakes [as Bournemouth]. Aware of Government housing requirements but the housing proposals in Pyrford would cause irreparable damage to the local community.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 23.0, 21.0, 19.0 and Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB12	There will be a negative impact from the increased number of cars and children, on narrow roads already used as cut throughs, making it difficult to residents to go out, and a village already at breaking point.	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
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB13	There will be a negative impact from the increased number of cars and children, on narrow roads already used as cut throughs, making it difficult to residents to go out, and a village already at breaking point.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB12	Questions how the Council would make homes affordable, as house prices in the village are already high for the average family. Help to Buy won't actually help people to buy.	None stated.	Proposals will have to comply with Development Plan policies, including Policy CS12 which sets out the requirement to provide affordable housing	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB13	Questions how the Council would make homes affordable, as house prices in the village are already high for the average family. Help to Buy won't actually help people to buy.	None stated.	Proposals will have to comply with Development Plan policies, including Policy CS12 which sets out the requirement to provide affordable housing	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB12	There are so many things wrong with the proposals, shame on the landowner would benefit from selling the land and inflicting misery on many. Please reconsider the plans.	None stated.	The objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1376	Victoria	Miles	GB13	There are so many things wrong with the proposals, shame on the landowner would benefit from selling the land and inflicting misery on many. Please reconsider the plans.	None stated.	The objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB8	Strong objections to further development of Mayford and Egley Road for housing and other construction work, based on the following;  Unsuitability of the area for further development - the only reason for choosing Mayford is that Martin Grant own land and it is an easy option for the Council, little else is in favour of Mayford being suitable.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB8	Area is at risk from flooding - Egley Road recently flooded. Saunders Lane floods in the winter and the fields to the north of the Lane are marshy. Water gushes down Green Lane when rain is heavy. Building will remove natural flood defences, putting the current properties at 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. It has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites. The key requirements of the proposals will also ensure that any site specific requirements are appropriately addressed as part of the development management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB8	Ongoing problems with sewerage and drainage evident from frequent road works, likely to be exacerbated by additional housing and public facilities.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The site specific requirements will also ensure that drainage matters are satisfactorily addressed as part of any proposal to develop the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB8	There is a perfectly good site in Sheerwater which already has a running track and there are no transport issues of which we are aware. This track is being removed for no good reason. I suggest it is a less attractive option for developers who look to a more central and prosperous area for investment.	None stated.	This land is already allocated in the DPD as Proposal UA32 to contribute towards the development needs of the area and the regeneration of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB8	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - the proposals are untenable with the current poor transport infrastructure. The plans do not take into account the increase in traffic and transport requirements of an increased population. Existing issues with pinch points holding up traffic, narrow winding roads with poor or non existent pavements, lack of pedestrian crossings and traffic calming, village already a rat run, dangerous junctions, lack of current and proposed parking facilities, small poorly developed railway station with little parking and no weekend service (Worplesdon), lack of parking at overcrowded Woking railway station, difficulties making doctors appointment, poor bus service, general lack of amenities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						standards of provision in the area	
148	John	Miller	GB8	Pollution - very concerned about potential rise in pollution. Likely to be increased traffic for longer periods with proposed leisure centre and arena. The congestion caused by poor road infrastructure is likely to cause increased pollution. Light and noise pollution from the arena will impact the quiet neighbourhood significantly. Its visual impact will spoil the current nature of the area. The suggestion that the public will be bussed to the arena from Woking Leisure Centre car park is ridiculous, there are already too few parking spaces.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB8	Lack of joined up work between Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council transport departments - insufficient information available on this issue at meetings about the developments.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council work closely with the County Council to ensure that the transport implications of the proposals are appropriate mitigated. It has worked with County Council to prepare the Core Strategy, the Community Infrastructure Levy. the Regulation 123 List. The County Council has carried out for the Council a Transport Assessment to assess the transport implication of the area. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals in the area is addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB7	Strong objections to further development of Mayford and Egley Road for housing and other construction work, based on the following;  Unsuitability of the area for further development - the only reason for choosing Mayford is that Martin Grant own land and it is an easy option for the Council, little else is in favour of Mayford being suitable.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB7	Area is at risk from flooding - Egley Road recently flooded. Saunders Lane floods in the winter and the fields to the north of the Lane are marshy. Water gushes down Green Lane when rain is heavy. Building will remove natural flood defences, putting the current properties at 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. It has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites. The key requirements of the proposals will also ensure that any site specific requirements are appropriately addressed as part of the development management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB7	Ongoing problems with sewerage and drainage evident from frequent road works, likely to be exacerbated by additional housing and public facilities.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The site specific requirements will also ensure that drainage matters are satisfactorily addressed as part of any proposal to develop the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB7	There is a perfectly good site in Sheerwater which already has a running track and there are no transport issues of which we are aware. This track is being removed for no good reason. I suggest it is a less attractive option for developers who look to a more central and prosperous area for investment.	None stated.	This land is already allocated in the DPD as Proposal UA32 to contribute towards the development needs of the area and the regeneration of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB7	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - the proposals are untenable with the current poor transport infrastructure. The plans do not take into account the increase in traffic and transport requirements of an increased population. Existing issues with pinch points holding up traffic, narrow winding roads with poor or non existent pavements, lack of pedestrian crossings and traffic calming, village already a rat run, dangerous junctions, lack of current and proposed parking facilities, small poorly developed railway station with little parking and no weekend service (Worplesdon), lack of parking at overcrowded Woking railway station, difficulties making doctors appointment, poor bus service, general lack of amenities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						standards of provision in the area	
148	John	Miller	GB7	Pollution - very concerned about potential rise in pollution. Likely to be increased traffic for longer periods with proposed leisure centre and arena. The congestion caused by poor road infrastructure is likely to cause increased pollution. Light and noise pollution from the arena will impact the quiet neighbourhood significantly. Its visual impact will spoil the current nature of the area. The suggestion that the public will be bussed to the arena from Woking Leisure Centre car park is ridiculous, there are already too few parking spaces.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Development Plan for the area includes robust number of policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB7	Lack of joined up work between Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council transport departments - insufficient information available on this issue at meetings about the developments.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council work closely with the County Council to ensure that the transport implications of the proposals are appropriate mitigated. It has worked with County Council to prepare the Core Strategy, the Community Infrastructure Levy. the Regulation 123 List. The County Council has carried out for the Council a Transport Assessment to assess the transport implication of the area. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals in the area is addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB9	Strong objections to further development of Mayford and Egley Road for housing and other construction work, based on the following;  Unsuitability of the area for further development - the only reason for choosing Mayford is that Martin Grant own land and it is an easy option for the Council, little else is in favour of Mayford being suitable.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB9	Area is at risk from flooding - Egley Road recently flooded. Saunders Lane floods in the winter and the fields to the north of the Lane are marshy. Water gushes down Green Lane when rain is heavy. Building will remove natural flood defences, putting the current properties at 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. It has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites. The key requirements of the proposals will also ensure that any site specific requirements are appropriately addressed as part of the development management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB9	Ongoing problems with sewerage and drainage evident from frequent road works, likely to be exacerbated by additional housing and public facilities.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The site specific requirements will also ensure that drainage matters are satisfactorily addressed as part of any proposal to develop the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB9	There is a perfectly good site in Sheerwater which already has a running track and there are no transport issues of which we are aware. This track is being removed for no good reason. I suggest it is a less attractive option for developers who look to a more central and prosperous area for investment.	None stated.	This land is already allocated in the DPD as Proposal UA32 to contribute towards the development needs of the area and the regeneration of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB9	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - the proposals are untenable with the current poor transport infrastructure. The plans do not take into account the increase in traffic and transport requirements of an increased population. Existing issues with pinch points holding up traffic, narrow winding roads with poor or non existent pavements, lack of pedestrian crossings and traffic calming, village already a rat run, dangerous junctions, lack of current and proposed parking facilities, small poorly developed railway station with little parking and no weekend service (Worplesdon), lack of parking at overcrowded Woking railway station, difficulties making doctors appointment, poor bus service, general lack of amenities.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB9	Pollution - very concerned about potential rise in pollution. Likely to be increased traffic for longer periods with proposed leisure centre and arena. The congestion caused by poor	None stated.	The Core Strategy has robust policies to make sure that the development of any of the sites does not lead to unacceptable pollution in the area. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				road infrastructure is likely to cause increased pollution. Light and noise pollution from the arena will impact the quiet neighbourhood significantly. Its visual impact will spoil the current nature of the area. The suggestion that the public will be bussed to the arena from Woking Leisure Centre car park is ridiculous, there are already too few parking spaces.		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.	
148	John	Miller	GB9	Lack of joined up work between Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council transport departments - insufficient information available on this issue at meetings about the developments.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council work closely with the County Council to ensure that the transport implications of the proposals are appropriate mitigated. It has worked with County Council to prepare the Core Strategy, the Community Infrastructure Levy. the Regulation 123 List. The County Council has carried out for the Council a Transport Assessment to assess the transport implication of the area. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals in the area is addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB10	Strong objections to further development of Mayford and Egley Road for housing and other construction work, based on the following;  Unsuitability of the area for further development - the only reason for choosing Mayford is that Martin Grant own land and it is an easy option for the Council, little else is in favour of Mayford being suitable.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB10	Area is at risk from flooding - Egley Road recently flooded. Saunders Lane floods in the winter and the fields to the north of the Lane are marshy. Water gushes down Green Lane when rain is heavy. Building will remove natural flood defences, putting the current properties at 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. It has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites. The key requirements of the proposals will also ensure that any site specific requirements are appropriately addressed as part of the development management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB10	Ongoing problems with sewerage and drainage evident from frequent road works, likely to be exacerbated by additional housing and public facilities.	None stated.	The infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 . The site specific key requirements of the proposals will ensure drainage issues associated with any proposal that comes forward is adequately addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB10	There is a perfectly good site in Sheerwater which already has a running track and there are no transport issues of which we are aware. This track is being removed for no good reason. I suggest it is a less attractive option for developers who look to a more central and prosperous area for investment.	None stated.	This land is already allocated in the DPD as Proposal UA32 to contribute towards the development needs of the area and the regeneration of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB10	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - the proposals are untenable with the current poor transport infrastructure. The plans do not take into account the increase in traffic and transport requirements of an increased population. Existing issues with pinch points holding up traffic, narrow winding roads with poor or non existent pavements, lack of pedestrian crossings and traffic calming, village already a rat run, dangerous junctions, lack of current and proposed parking facilities, small poorly developed railway station with little parking and no weekend service (Worplesdon), lack of parking at overcrowded Woking railway station, difficulties making doctors appointment, poor bus service, general lack of amenities.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Parking provision to serve any proposed development will be in accordance with the parking standards of the Council. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is	No further modification is 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 work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
148	John	Miller	GB10	Pollution - very concerned about potential rise in pollution. Likely to be increased traffic for longer periods with proposed leisure centre and arena. The congestion caused by poor road infrastructure is likely to cause increased pollution. Light and noise pollution from the arena will impact the quiet neighbourhood significantly. Its visual impact will spoil the current nature of the area. The suggestion that the public will be bussed to the arena from Woking Leisure Centre car park is ridiculous, there are already too few parking spaces.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policies to ensure that the adverse impacts of the development on pollution is minimised. The justification for the release 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
148	John	Miller	GB10	Lack of joined up work between Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council transport departments - insufficient information available on this issue at meetings about the developments.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council work closely with the County Council to ensure that the transport implications of the proposals are appropriate mitigated. It has worked with County Council to prepare the Core Strategy, the Community Infrastructure Levy. the Regulation 123 List. The County Council has carried out for the Council a Transport Assessment to assess the transport implication of the area. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals in the area is addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB11	Strong objections to further development of Mayford and Egley Road for housing and other construction work, based on the following;  Unsuitability of the area for further development - the only reason for choosing Mayford is that Martin Grant own land and it is an easy option for the Council, little else is in favour of Mayford being suitable.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB11	Area is at risk from flooding - Egley Road recently flooded. Saunders Lane floods in the winter and the fields to the north of the Lane are marshy. Water gushes down Green Lane when rain is heavy. Building will remove natural flood defences, putting the current properties at 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. It has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites. The key requirements of the proposals will also ensure that any site specific requirements are appropriately addressed as part of the development management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB11	Ongoing problems with sewerage and drainage evident from frequent road works, likely to be exacerbated by additional housing and public facilities.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The site specific requirements will also ensure that drainage matters are satisfactorily addressed as part of any proposal to develop the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB11	There is a perfectly good site in Sheerwater which already has a running track and there are no transport issues of which we are aware. This track is being removed for no good reason. I suggest it is a less attractive option for developers who look to a more central and prosperous area for investment.	None stated.	This land is already allocated in the DPD as Proposal UA32 to contribute towards the development needs of the area and the regeneration of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB11	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - the proposals are untenable with the current poor transport infrastructure. The plans do not take into account the increase in traffic and transport requirements of an increased population. Existing issues with pinch points holding up traffic, narrow winding roads with poor or non existent pavements, lack of pedestrian crossings and traffic calming, village already a rat run, dangerous junctions, lack of current and proposed parking facilities, small poorly developed railway station with little parking and no weekend service (Worplesdon), lack of parking at overcrowded Woking railway station, difficulties making doctors appointment, poor bus service, general lack of amenities.	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	No further modification is 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. As part of Transport 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>	
148	John	Miller	GB11	<p>Pollution - very concerned about potential rise in pollution. Likely to be increased traffic for longer periods with proposed leisure centre and arena. The congestion caused by poor road infrastructure is likely to cause increased pollution. Light and noise pollution from the arena will impact the quiet neighbourhood significantly. Its visual impact will spoil the current nature of the area. The suggestion that the public will be bussed to the arena from Woking Leisure Centre car park is ridiculous, there are already too few parking spaces.</p>	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB11	<p>Lack of joined up work between Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council transport departments - insufficient information available on this issue at meetings about the developments.</p>	None stated.	<p>Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council work closely with the County Council to ensure that the transport implications of the proposals are appropriately mitigated. It has worked with County Council to prepare the Core Strategy, the Community Infrastructure Levy. the Regulation 123 List. The County Council has carried out for the Council a Transport Assessment to assess the transport implication of the area. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals in the area is addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB14	<p>Strong objections to further development of Mayford and Egley Road for housing and other construction work, based on the following;</p> <p>Unsuitability of the area for further development - the only reason for choosing Mayford is that Martin Grant own land and it is an easy option for the Council, little else is in favour of Mayford being suitable.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB14	<p>Area is at risk from flooding - Egley Road recently flooded. Saunders Lane floods in the winter and the fields to the north of the Lane are marshy. Water gushes down Green Lane when rain is heavy. Building will remove natural flood</p>	None stated.	<p>The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites. The key requirements of the proposals will also ensure that any site specific requirements are appropriately addressed as part of the development management process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				defences, putting the current properties at risk.			
148	John	Miller	GB14	Ongoing problems with sewerage and drainage evident from frequent road works, likely to be exacerbated by additional housing and public facilities.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The site specific requirements will also ensure that drainage matters are satisfactorily addressed as part of any proposal to develop the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB14	There is a perfectly good site in Sheerwater which already has a running track and there are no transport issues of which we are aware. This track is being removed for no good reason. I suggest it is a less attractive option for developers who look to a more central and prosperous area for investment.	None stated.	This land is already allocated in the DPD as Proposal UA32 to contribute towards the development needs of the area and the regeneration of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
148	John	Miller	GB14	Poor local infrastructure to support further development - the proposals are untenable with the current poor transport infrastructure. The plans do not take into account the increase in traffic and transport requirements of an increased population. Existing issues with pinch points holding up traffic, narrow winding roads with poor or non existent pavements, lack of pedestrian crossings and traffic calming, village already a rat run, dangerous junctions, lack of current and proposed parking facilities, small poorly developed railway station with little parking and no weekend service (Worplesdon), lack of parking at overcrowded Woking railway station, difficulties making doctors appointment, poor bus service, general lack of amenities.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</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
148	John	Miller	GB14	Pollution - very concerned about potential rise in pollution. Likely to be increased traffic for longer periods with proposed leisure centre and arena. The congestion caused by poor road infrastructure is likely to cause increased pollution. Light and noise pollution from the arena will impact the quiet neighbourhood significantly. Its visual impact will spoil the current nature of the area. The suggestion that the public will be bussed to the arena from Woking Leisure Centre car park is ridiculous, there are already too few parking spaces.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. 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	
148	John	Miller	GB14	Lack of joined up work between Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council transport departments - insufficient information available on this issue at meetings about the developments.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council work closely with the County Council to ensure that the transport implications of the proposals are appropriate mitigated. It has worked with County Council to prepare the Core Strategy, the Community Infrastructure Levy. the Regulation 123 List. The County Council has carried out for the Council a Transport Assessment to assess the transport implication of the area. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals in the area is addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB10	Given the significant lack of open public green space in South Woking, it seems the perfect opportunity to preserve these areas whilst safeguarding public open green space for all to enjoy, rather than build high density, low quality homes.	Safeguard public open green space for all to enjoy.	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB11	Given the significant lack of open public green space in South Woking, it seems the perfect opportunity to preserve these areas whilst safeguarding public open green space for all to enjoy, rather than build high density, low quality homes.	Safeguard public open green space for all to enjoy.	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB10	Refers to recent prominent government and independent reports stressing the huge value of green open public spaces and their positive impact in terms of well being, health, community benefits and monetary savings on the over-burdened NHS. The classification of land to become open public green space makes perfect sense.	Classification of the land to become open public green space.	The Council agrees that open space can have amenity value as well as a positive impact on the health and well-being of local communities. In addition to the open space requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS17, the Council has specifically identified sites for public open space. These proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGs) and Country Park sites are noted in the draft Site Allocations DPD under site references GB17 to GB22. Site GB14 is also identified for Green Infrastructure purposes and not for development.  The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed safeguarded site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB11	Refers to recent prominent government and independent reports stressing the huge value of green open public spaces and their positive impact in terms of well being, health, community benefits and monetary savings on the over-burdened NHS. The classification of land to become open public green space makes perfect sense.	Classification of the land to become open public green space.	The Council agrees that open space can have amenity value as well as a positive impact on the health and well-being of local communities. In addition to the open space requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS17, the Council has specifically identified sites for public open space. These proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGs) and Country Park sites are noted in the draft Site Allocations DPD under site references GB17 to GB22. Site GB14 is also identified for Green Infrastructure purposes and not for development.  The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed safeguarded site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB10	In summary, while we recognise the need for WBC to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable and quality character housing, the current proposals seen in detail and in the context of the surrounding area of Hook Heath and Mayford, seem in complete contradiction of National Planning Policy. The proposals have at their core a wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open space and woodland and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	Urges the Council to consider classifying these areas as a publicly accessible open green space for the community and safeguard	The Council does not consider the Site Allocations DPD or its approach in preparing the document to be contradiction with the NPPF. This is addressed in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.  The representation regarding landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The representation regarding the character of Mayford and Hook Heath has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					their immediate and long term future against development.	<p>an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council note the suggestion and proposed modification. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised.</p>	
494	C	Miller	GB11	In summary, while we recognise the need for WBC to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable and quality character housing, the current proposals seen in detail and in the context of the surrounding area of Hook Heath and Mayford, seem in complete contradiction of National Planning Policy. The proposals have at their core a wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open space and woodland and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	Urges the Council to consider classifying these areas as a publicly accessible open green space for the community and safeguard their immediate and long term future against development.	<p>The Council does not consider the Site Allocations DPD or its approach in preparing the document to be contradiction with the NPPF. This is addressed in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford and Hook Heath has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Council note the suggestion and proposed modification. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution towards meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB14	In summary, while we recognise the need for WBC to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable and quality character housing, the current proposals seen in detail and in the context of the surrounding area of Hook Heath and Mayford, seem in complete contradiction of National Planning Policy. The proposals have at their core a wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open space and woodland and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The Council does not consider the Site Allocations DPD or its approach in preparing the document to be contradiction with the NPPF. This is addressed in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford and Hook Heath has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>It should be also noted that Site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB10	National Planning Policy states release of Green Belt should only take place in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy states the need to find sites for 550 homes from 2022-2027, but these proposals aim to build an additional 1,200 homes from 2027-2040. This need is not yet defined nor based on firm evidence, and therefore the Council has not demonstrated any exceptional need for this, or any, number of dwellings in the Green Belt post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB11	National Planning Policy states release of Green Belt should only take place in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy states the need to find sites for 550 homes from 2022-2027, but these proposals aim to build an additional 1,200 homes from 2027-2040. This need is not yet defined nor based on firm evidence, and therefore the Council has not demonstrated any exceptional need for this, or any, number of dwellings in the Green Belt post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB14	National Planning Policy states release of Green Belt should only take place in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy states the need to find sites for 550 homes from	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				2022-2027, but these proposals aim to build an additional 1,200 homes from 2027-2040. This need is not yet defined nor based on firm evidence, and therefore the Council has not demonstrated any exceptional need for this, or any, number of dwellings in the Green Belt post 2027.			
494	C	Miller	GB10	The purpose and definition of Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. The proposals do exactly the opposite, and merge Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking itself.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 12.0, and for justification for the release of Green Belt land, as background to the Council's approach, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB11	The purpose and definition of Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. The proposals do exactly the opposite, and merge Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking itself.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 12.0, and for justification for the release of Green Belt land, as background to the Council's approach, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB14	The purpose and definition of Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. The proposals do exactly the opposite, and merge Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking itself.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 12.0, and for justification for the release of Green Belt land, as background to the Council's approach, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB10	Writing with regard to areas in the vicinity of Hook Heath and Mayford commonly referred to as The Escarpment, to register significant concern about development in these areas, particularly sites GB10 and GB11.	Do not remove Green Belt status of these sites, and suggests they become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space, in effect a natural country park.	<p>The Council notes the objection.</p> <p>The Council agrees that open space can have amenity value as well as a positive impact on the health and well-being of local communities. In addition to the open space requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS17, the Council has specifically identified sites for public open space. These proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGs) and Country Park sites are noted in the draft Site Allocations DPD under site references GB17 to GB22. Site GB14 is also identified for Green Infrastructure purposes and not for development.</p> <p>The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed safeguarded site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
494	C	Miller	GB11	Writing with regard to areas in the vicinity of Hook Heath and Mayford commonly referred to as The Escarpment, to register significant concern about development in these areas, particularly sites GB10 and GB11.	Do not remove Green Belt status of these sites, and suggests they become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space, in effect a natural country park.	<p>The Council notes the objection.</p> <p>The Council agrees that open space can have amenity value as well as a positive impact on the health and well-being of local communities. In addition to the open space requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS17, the Council has specifically identified sites for public open space. These proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGs) and Country Park sites are noted in the draft Site Allocations DPD under site references GB17 to GB22. Site GB14 is also identified for Green Infrastructure purposes and not for development.</p> <p>The Council has acknowledged the representation made to use the site for open public green space. However by removing this proposed safeguarded site from the draft Site Allocations without an alternative site, the Council will be required to carry out another review of the Green Belt boundary to meet development needs of the next local plan.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
867	Tracy	Miller	UA28	Do not develop back gardens, other sites should be used.	None stated.	<p>There is a significant housing need within the Borough as set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>See Section 9.0,10.0,11.0 and 16.0 also, which explains how the Council has comprehensively assessed potential sites for allocation.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
867	Tracy	Miller	UA28	Own the lease for property within development proposal. Spent a lot of money on the back garden and rents a garage. Objects to proposals to build on the back gardens and garages. Residents of Willow Way have to give up all their gardens, whilst others 50%. Will have to live on the edge of a building site.	Leave the gardens alone for Willow Way. Leave some garage provision, the estate is not	<p>There is a significant housing need within the Borough as set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 1.0.</p> <p>See Section 9.0,10.0,11.0 and 16.0 also, which explains how the Council has comprehensively assessed potential sites for allocation.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					build for the amount of cars and many of us rent these garages at the back of Willow way.		
867	Tracy	Miller	NS	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
867	Tracy	Miller	NS	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1139	Tom	Miller	GB12	I object. The plan takes no obvious account of the traffic infrastructure impact.	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
1139	Tom	Miller	GB13	I object. The plan takes no obvious account of the traffic infrastructure impact.	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
1139	Tom	Miller	GB12	No account taken of the impact on healthcare and schools, no plans to improve public transport worsening traffic. No consideration of the impact housing will have on the local community. I object and will do all that I can to prevent the developments taking place.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals 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 service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1139	Tom	Miller	GB13	No account taken of the impact on healthcare and schools, no plans to improve public transport worsening traffic. No consideration of the impact housing will have on the local community. I object and will do all that I can to prevent the developments taking place.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals 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 service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1398	Nicholas	Miller	GB12	Objects to the proposals, which would destroy the historic setting and landscape of the area which has changed very little for centuries.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1398	Nicholas	Miller	GB13	Objects to the proposals, which would destroy the historic setting and landscape of the area which has changed very little for centuries.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1398	Nicholas	Miller	GB12	The Council has ignored residents representations and also its own professional advice.	None stated.	As noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. Responding to this (Regulation 18) consultation is the correct method and time for residents, groups and all other stakeholders to voice their concerns. The representation is further addressed in Section 17.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1398	Nicholas	Miller	GB13	The Council has ignored residents representations and also its own professional advice.	None stated.	As noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. Responding to this (Regulation 18) consultation is the correct method and time for residents, groups and all other stakeholders to voice their concerns. The representation is further addressed in Section 17.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1398	Nicholas	Miller	GB12	Surrounding roads are already overstretched and would be unable to cope with this and the combined effect of other proposed development nearby. Urges a rethink.	None stated.	This representation 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
1398	Nicholas	Miller	GB13	Surrounding roads are already overstretched and would be unable to cope with this and the combined effect of other proposed development nearby. Urges a rethink.	None stated.	This representation 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
98	Valerie	Mills	GB7	Strongly object to increase in number of Traveller Pitches, principally because Ten Acre Farm is next door to Smarts Heath Common SSSI, whose visual amenity and character should be maintained, for residents of Mayford and everyone.	Please reconsider your plans.	The allocation of Ten Acres to provide pitches is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.  There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						continue to work 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	
98	Valerie	Mills	GB7	Development would increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals nearby.	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
98	Valerie	Mills	GB7	Planning applications have previously been refused on this site due to the reduction in openness of the Green Belt Area, I feel strongly that this should continue to be maintained.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB7	There would be no easy access to jobs, shops or other services for any new residents.	Please reconsider your plans.	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
98	Valerie	Mills	GB8	Support the use of some of the land in GB8 for a new secondary school and associated leisure facilities, including an 8 lane athletics track.	Please reconsider your plans.	The school and leisure centre now has planning permission	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB8	Strongly object to housing on this site for following reasons: by filling in the green space between Mayford and Woking, the distinct character of Mayford will be lost as it is merged in with Woking. This will mean loss of a separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book and increases the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future, as the Mayford roundabout is only 2 miles from Slyfield.	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 , 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base is in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB8	Mayford's infrastructure is already under pressure. No account seems to have been taken of the impact of further housing in the area, especially as there have already been 550 new homes built recently at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. It can already take over half an hour to reach Woking during peak hours due to gridlock on the roads, which include single lane railway bridges and access to Worplesdon Station via a road with no pavements. There are no services in Mayford, with the only shops being a post office and barbers and the new proposals do not address this situation.	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. As part of Transport 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						standards of provision in the area	
98	Valerie	Mills	GB8	The wildlife in the Green Belt will be wiped out, Housing development will lead to increased risks to wildlife in neighbouring Smarts and Prey Heaths SSSIs.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans.	Comments noted. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB9	Strongly object to housing on this site for following reasons: by filling in the green space between Mayford and Woking, the distinct character of Mayford will be lost as it is merged in with Woking. This will mean loss of a separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book and increases the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future, as the Mayford roundabout is only 2 miles from Slyfield.	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 , 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base is in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB9	Mayford's infrastructure is already under pressure. No account seems to have been taken of the impact of further housing in the area, especially as there have already been 550 new homes built recently at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. It can already take over half an hour to reach Woking during peak hours due to gridlock on the roads, which include single lane railway bridges and access to Worplesdon Station via a road with no pavements. There are no services in Mayford, with the only shops being a post office and barbers and the new proposals do not address this situation.	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. As part of Transport 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
98	Valerie	Mills	GB9	The wildlife in the Green Belt will be wiped out, Housing development will lead to increased risks to wildlife in neighbouring Smarts and Prey Heaths SSSIs.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
98	Valerie	Mills	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB10	Strongly object to housing on this site for following reasons: by filling in the green space between Mayford and Woking, the distinct character of Mayford will be lost as it is merged in with Woking. This will mean loss of a separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book and increases the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future, as the Mayford roundabout is only 2 miles from Slyfield.	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 , 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base is in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB10	Mayford's infrastructure is already under pressure. No account seems to have been taken of the impact of further housing in the area, especially as there have already been 550 new homes built recently at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. It can already take over half an hour to reach Woking during peak hours due to gridlock on the roads, which include single lane railway bridges and access to Worplesdon Station via a road with no pavements. There are no services in Mayford, with the only shops being a post office and barbers and the new proposals do not address this situation.	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 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
98	Valerie	Mills	GB10	The wildlife in the Green Belt will be wiped out, Housing development will lead to increased risks to wildlife in neighbouring Smarts and Prey Heaths SSSIs.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB11	Strongly object to housing on this site for following reasons: by filling in the green space between Mayford and Woking, the distinct character of Mayford will be lost as it is merged in with Woking. This will mean loss of a separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book and increases the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future, as the Mayford roundabout is only 2 miles from Slyfield.	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 , 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base is in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
98	Valerie	Mills	GB11	Mayford's infrastructure is already under pressure. No account seems to have been taken of the impact of further housing in the area, especially as there have already been 550 new homes built recently at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. It can already take over half an hour to reach Woking during peak hours due to gridlock on the roads, which include single lane railway bridges and access to Worplesdon Station via a road with no pavements. There are no services in Mayford, with the only shops being a post office and barbers and the new proposals do not address this situation.	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
98	Valerie	Mills	GB11	The wildlife in the Green Belt will be wiped out, Housing development will lead to increased risks to wildlife in neighbouring Smarts and Prey Heaths SSSIs.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB14	Strongly object to housing on this site for following reasons: by filling in the green space between Mayford and Woking, the distinct character of Mayford will be lost as it is merged in with Woking. This will mean loss of a separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book and increases the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future, as the Mayford roundabout is only 2 miles from Slyfield.	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, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base is in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and is satisfied that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford will not be compromised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						This particular issue is also addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
98	Valerie	Mills	GB14	Mayford's infrastructure is already under pressure. No account seems to have been taken of the impact of further housing in the area, especially as there have already been 550 new homes built recently at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. It can already take over half an hour to reach Woking during peak hours due to gridlock on the roads, which include single lane railway bridges and access to Worplesdon Station via a road with no pavements. There are no services in Mayford, with the only shops being a post office and barbers and the new proposals do not address this situation.	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
98	Valerie	Mills	GB14	The wildlife in the Green Belt will be wiped out, Housing development will lead to increased risks to wildlife in neighbouring Smarts and Prey Heaths SSSIs.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
98	Valerie	Mills	GB14	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Also see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB8	New housing at Moor Lane will increase traffic in the area.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared in the context of the growth set out in the Core Strategy and therefore factors in proposals that are in the pipeline or under construction.</p> <p>Nevertheless, specific infrastructure requirements for the site were considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>This representation has also been comprehensively 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
869	David	Mills	GB9	New housing at Moor Lane will increase traffic in the area.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared in the context of the growth set out in the Core Strategy and therefore factors in proposals that are in the pipeline or under construction.</p> <p>Nevertheless, specific infrastructure requirements for the site were considered as part of the planning application process.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	
869	David	Mills	GB10	New housing at Moor Lane will increase traffic in the area.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared in the context of the growth set out in the Core Strategy and therefore factors in proposals that are in the pipeline or under construction.</p> <p>Nevertheless, specific infrastructure requirements for the site were considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>This representation has also been comprehensively 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
869	David	Mills	GB11	New housing at Moor Lane will increase traffic in the area.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared in the context of the growth set out in the Core Strategy and therefore factors in proposals that are in the pipeline or under construction.</p> <p>Nevertheless, specific infrastructure requirements for the site were considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>This representation has also been comprehensively 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
869	David	Mills	GB14	New housing at Moor Lane will increase traffic in the area.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared in the context of the growth set out in the Core Strategy and therefore factors in proposals that are in the pipeline or under construction.</p> <p>Nevertheless, specific infrastructure requirements for the site were considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>This representation has also been comprehensively 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
869	David	Mills	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
869	David	Mills	GB7	Object to the number of pitches as the adjacent Smarts Heath Common SSSI's character should be maintained.	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
869	David	Mills	GB8	Support the use of land for new secondary school and associate leisure facilities. Objects to developing the sites for housing.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separate between settlements and impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>The Council note the presentation regarding the rural character of south Woking. In addition to the above, the Council has also published a Landscape Character Assessment. More information on the landscape implications of the proposed allocations is set out 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. In addition, Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
869	David	Mills	GB9	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Infilling the green space between Mayford and Woking will lose Mayford's distinct character and it will merge in with other outer Woking suburbs. Loss of separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book. Increased the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future. Open land around Mayford provides a rural character to SW Woking.	None stated.	The representation regarding the separate between settlements and impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  The Council note the presentation regarding the rural character of south Woking. In addition to the above, the Council has also published a Landscape Character Assessment. More information on the landscape implications of the proposed allocations is set out 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. In addition, 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
869	David	Mills	GB10	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Infilling the green space between Mayford and Woking will lose Mayford's distinct character and it will merge in with other outer Woking suburbs. Loss of separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book. Increased the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future. Open land around Mayford provides a rural character to SW Woking.	None stated.	The representation regarding the separate between settlements and impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  The Council note the presentation regarding the rural character of south Woking. In addition to the above, the Council has also published a Landscape Character Assessment. More information on the landscape implications of the proposed allocations is set out 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. In addition, 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
869	David	Mills	GB11	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Infilling the green space between Mayford and Woking will lose Mayford's distinct character and it will merge in with other outer Woking suburbs. Loss of separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book. Increased the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future. Open land around Mayford provides a rural character to SW Woking.	None stated.	The representation regarding the separate between settlements and impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  The Council note the presentation regarding the rural character of south Woking. In addition to the above, the Council has also published a Landscape Character Assessment. More information on the landscape implications of the proposed allocations is set out 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. In addition, 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
869	David	Mills	GB14	Object to housing in the Green Belt. Infilling the green space between Mayford and Woking will lose Mayford's distinct character and it will merge in with other outer Woking suburbs. Loss of separate settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book. Increased the risk of Woking and Guildford merging in the future. Open land around Mayford provides a rural character to SW Woking.	None stated.	The representation regarding the separate between settlements and impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  The Council note the presentation regarding the rural character of south Woking. In addition to the above, the Council has also published a Landscape Character Assessment. More information on the landscape implications of the proposed allocations is set out 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. In addition, 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
869	David	Mills	GB7	No easy access to jobs, shops or services.	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
869	David	Mills	GB8	Mayford's infrastructure limited. New proposals do not address this.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops	No further modification is proposed as a result



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB9	Mayford has limited infrastructure. New proposals do not address this.	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
869	David	Mills	GB10	Mayford has limited infrastructure. New proposals do not address this.	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
869	David	Mills	GB11	Mayford has limited infrastructure. New proposals do not address this.	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
869	David	Mills	GB14	Mayford has limited infrastructure. New proposals do not address this.	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
869	David	Mills	GB8	<p>Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views on</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposed housing development.		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.	
869	David	Mills	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views on proposed housing development.	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
869	David	Mills	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views on proposed housing development.	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
869	David	Mills	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views on proposed housing development.	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
869	David	Mills	GB14	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views on proposed housing development.	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
869	David	Mills	GB7	Risk to wildlife due to increase in nearby domestic animals.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI.  The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB8	Wildlife in the Green Belt will be severely affected. Increased risk to wildlife in Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSIs.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.  Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.  The Council is satisfied the allocation of development sites in the area will not have significant	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the draft allocations. 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 on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
869	David	Mills	GB9	Wildlife in the Green Belt will be severely affected. Increased risk to wildlife in Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSIs.	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 is satisfied the allocation of development sites in the area will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the draft allocations. 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 on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB10	Wildlife in the Green Belt will be severely affected. Increased risk to wildlife in Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSIs.	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 is satisfied the allocation of development sites in the area will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the draft allocations. 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 on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB11	Wildlife in the Green Belt will be severely affected. Increased risk to wildlife in Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSIs.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied the allocation of development sites in the area will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the draft allocations. 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 on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p>	
869	David	Mills	GB14	Wildlife in the Green Belt will be severely affected. Increased risk to wildlife in Smarts Heath and Prey Heath SSSIs.	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 is satisfied the allocation of development sites in the area will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the draft allocations. 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 on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB8	Support the use of land for new secondary school and associate leisure facilities.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school with associated leisure facilities, including an 8 lane athletics track, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB9	Support the use of some land in GB8 for new secondary school and associated facilities and athletics track.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school with associated leisure facilities, including an 8 lane athletics track, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB10	Support the use of some land in GB8 for new secondary school and associated facilities and athletics track.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school with associated leisure facilities, including an 8 lane athletics track, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
869	David	Mills	GB11	Support the use of some land in GB8 for new secondary school and associated facilities and athletics track.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school with associated leisure facilities, including an 8 lane athletics track, 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
869	David	Mills	GB14	Support the use of some land in GB8 for new secondary school and associated facilities and athletics track.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school with associated leisure facilities, including an 8 lane athletics track, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Development could increase water run off and impact the flood plain.	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
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Development could increase water run off and impact the flood plain.	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
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	The road network is already at capacity and further development would make this worse. The Council have not taken the Wisley Airfield development into account.	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
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB13	The road network is already at capacity and further development would make this worse. The Council have not taken the Wisley Airfield development into account.	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Object to release of Green Belt land for development. An adequate case for release has not been made.	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 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB13	Object to release of Green Belt land for development. An adequate case for release has not been made.	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 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Infrastructure including education, water supply and sewage disposal, are at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10.  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Infrastructure including education, water supply and sewage disposal, are at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10.  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	The bus service is limited, making reliance on cars essential.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.  Deficiencies in public transport is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.  The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	The bus service is limited, making reliance on cars essential.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.  Deficiencies in public transport is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.  The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Would change the character of the approach to Pyrford from a rural outlook to an urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB13	Would change the character of the approach to Pyrford from a rural outlook to an urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Recognise the need for homes for first time buyers and downsizers however the site is not appropriate and the scale of development is too large.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough.  However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.	No further modification is 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 also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.</p> <p>In addition, proposals will be required to meet Core Strategy CS12 which requires provision of affordable housing.</p>	
1061	Ian Elizabeth	Mills	GB12	Recognise the need for homes for first time buyers and downsizers however the site is not appropriate and the scale of development is too large.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that downsizing options for the elderly to free up family homes will not be a panacea to meet housing need, it will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough. The housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied.</p> <p>There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.</p> <p>In addition, proposals will be required to meet Core Strategy CS12 which requires provision of affordable housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
201	Audrey	Milne	GB12	Has the Council thought this through or is it another knee jerk reaction to provide houses no matter what. Will Upshot Lane be widened? The school enlarged? Another doctors' surgery? What about the parking? Parking already chaotic and difficult.	None stated.	<p>The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
201	Audrey	Milne	GB13	Has the Council thought this through or is it another knee jerk reaction to provide houses no matter what. Will Upshot Lane be widened? The school enlarged? Another doctors' surgery? What about the parking? Parking already chaotic and difficult.	None stated.	<p>The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
201	Audrey	Milne	GB12	I know there has to be new housing but I need reassurance that these points have been considered. Pyrford used to be a village but will now merge with West Byfleet. I hope the Council hasn't agreed to these homes just because of the money it will bring in. I hope you consider all letters properly.	None stated.	The Council is allocating the proposed sites to meet development needs of the area. The development needs of the area went through extensive public consultation and a public examination before they were agreed as part of the adopted Core Strategy. Based on the evidence, the Council believes that the overall character of Pyrford and West Byfleet will not be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in Sections 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
201	Audrey	Milne	GB13	I know there has to be new housing but I need reassurance that these points have been considered. Pyrford used to be a village but will now merge with West Byfleet. I hope the Council hasn't agreed to these homes just because of the money it will bring in. I hope you consider all letters properly.	None stated.	The proposals are to meet the development needs of the area. The development needs of the area has been through an extensive community involvement and a public examination before adopted as part of the Core Strategy. The Council have analysed all comments received, which will be in the public domain. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, it is not envisaged the general character of Pyrford and West Byfleet will be significantly undermined. This particular issues is addressed in Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB12	A new playground would have to be built as part of the development as the existing one is only accessible by car from the new development.	None stated.	Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The need for on-site provision will be determined on a case by case basis and informed by evidence.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB13	A new playground would have to be built as part of the development as the existing one is only accessible by car from the new development.	None stated.	Policy CS17: Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect open space provision in the area. The regulation 123 List quantifies what is needed and how that will be funded. The need for on-site provision will be determined on a case by case basis and informed by evidence.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB12	The GBBR did not recommend the field behind Aviary Road, questions why it had been included.	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
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB13	The GBBR did not recommend the field behind Aviary Road, questions why it had been included.	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
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB12	Land should not be considered for removal from the Green Belt until after Britain's referendum on EU membership. The population has increased due to immigration, increasing housing demand. Should we leave the EU , housing.	None stated.	To clarify, most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 which comprehensively explains the significant housing need within the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB13	Land should not be considered for removal from the Green Belt until after Britain's referendum on EU membership. The population has increased due to immigration, increasing housing demand. Should we leave the EU , housing.	None stated.	To clarify, most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated.  Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 which comprehensively explains the significant housing need within the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB12	The road network is already at capacity, therefore the road system would have to be widened to support the additional housing. This would destroy the rural nature of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB13	The road network is already at capacity, therefore the road system would have to be widened to support the additional housing. This would destroy the rural nature of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB12	The local infrastructure is already at capacity, therefore another school and GP surgery will have to be built to support the additional housing.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB13	The local infrastructure is already at capacity, therefore another school and GP surgery will have to be built to support the additional housing.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB12	Object to the proposals. Building this number of houses is a huge percentage increase in the size of the village and ruin its character. The rural character of the site would be destroyed.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment and requires development to be built to high design standards.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1051	Robin Anna	Milner	GB13	Object to the proposals. Building this number of houses is a huge percentage increase in the size of the village and ruin its character. The rural character of the site would be destroyed.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment and requires development to be built to high design standards.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	The vast number of care homes is reducing the amount of land available for new schools.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs. The Council, as part of the objectives of the Green Belt boundary review, has identified a site within the Green Belt for educational uses. This is noted within Site Allocation GB8.</p> <p>It should be noted that care home and specialist accommodation are an important part of the housing mix in the Borough. The Council supports the retention of existing and development of new specialist accommodation to meet the aging population of the Borough. This is set out in more detail in Core Strategy Policy CS13.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	The vast number of care homes is reducing the amount of land available for new schools.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Site Allocations includes over 50 sites within the existing urban area for a wide range of development. Nevertheless land is a finite resource and as noted in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed that the Green Belt should be a future direction of growth to meet part of the borough's housing needs. The Council, as part of the objectives of the Green Belt boundary review, has identified a site within the Green Belt for educational uses. This is noted within Site Allocation GB8.</p> <p>It should be noted that care home and specialist accommodation are an important part of the housing mix in the Borough. The Council supports the retention of existing and development of new specialist accommodation to meet the aging population of the Borough. This is set out in more detail in Core Strategy Policy CS13.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	Unable to hear much at the public meeting due to the audio system	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	Unable to hear much at the public meeting due to the audio system	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	Other areas of the borough should share their Green Belt areas.	Other areas of the borough should share Green Belt development	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Green Belt boundary review sets out	No further modification is 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 detail the site identification process.	
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	Other areas of the borough should share their Green Belt areas.	Other areas of the borough should share Green Belt development	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Green Belt boundary review sets out in detail the site identification process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	Healthcare provision has reduced	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
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	Healthcare provision has reduced	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
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	Unhappy with the proposals on Green Belt. A245 is congested already and parking is difficult in West Byfleet. The quality of life of residents will fall as WBC have not considered the wider picture. Other Green Belt sites should be considered to share the load.	Other Green Belt sites should be considered to share development	<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>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
						<p>not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD sets out a number of sites that are suitable for development needs. The DPD proposes to allocate land across the Borough for dwellings, commercial and retail floor space and recreational needs. Sites GB15 and GB16 provide an important contribution to delivering the Council's economic and housing objectives which are set out in the Core Strategy. Nevertheless it should be noted that they are not the only sites being proposed.</p> <p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing 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. In addition the Council's approach to assessing alternative sites in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	Unhappy with the proposals on Green Belt. A245 is congested already and parking is difficult in West Byfleet. The quality of life of residents will fall as WBC have not considered the wider picture. Other Green Belt sites should be considered to share the load.	Other Green Belt sites should be considered to share development	<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>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD sets out a number of sites that are suitable for development needs. The DPD proposes to allocate land across the Borough for dwellings, commercial and retail</p>	No further modification is 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>floor space and recreational needs. Sites GB15 and GB16 provide an important contribution to delivering the Council's economic and housing objectives which are set out in the Core Strategy. Nevertheless it should be noted that they are not the only sites being proposed.</p> <p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing 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. In addition the Council's approach to assessing alternative sites in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	Parvis Road and local roads are unable to cope with a development of this scale. Developments proposed at Wisley will also have an impact on local roads. What about access to utilities under the road network.	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 noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	The A245 and local roads are unable to cope with a development of this scale. Developments proposed at Wisley will also have an impact on local roads. What about access to utilities under the road network.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p>	
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	The Marist School has a wide catchment area, resulting in more car journeys.	None stated.	It is noted by the Council that a combination of wider catchment areas and parental choice can result in more traffic and congestion on the road network. The proposed site allocations are within close proximity to the existing educational facilities within the Borough and public transport and therefore should reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	The Marist School has a wide catchment area, resulting in more car journeys.	None stated.	It is noted by the Council that a combination of wider catchment areas and parental choice can result in more traffic and congestion on the road network. The proposed site allocations are within close proximity to the existing educational facilities within the Borough and public transport and therefore should reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	Pollution levels have increased.	None stated.	<p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition the Development Management Policies DPD and Core Strategy provide a robust policy framework to ensure that development does not significantly increase pollution levels.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	Pollution levels have increased.	None stated.	<p>The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition the Development Management Policies DPD and Core Strategy provide a robust policy framework to ensure that development does not significantly increase pollution levels.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1586	C M	Milner	GB15	Traffic volume has increased in 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 assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1586	C M	Milner	GB16	Traffic volume has increased in 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 assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that comes 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	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
255	P	Mintram	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
255	P	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council is 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>	
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					brownfield sites		of this representation
256	F R	Mintram	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
256	F R	Mintram	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
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without 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
1186	Soofia	Mir	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm	The general approach 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				other 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.	proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. The comment about the poor level of public transport services in the area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test. There is no evidence to suggest that there will be health and safety issues for children playing near the Hoe Stream or children activities will result in more debris in the water.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The 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.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				circumstances. 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.		the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This issue is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the allocation of sites. This particular matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.  Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. It is not envisaged that the development	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive development.		will undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites as set in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land 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 - see Section 11 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper for detailed response to this particular issue. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating that it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking (estimated using Google Maps timings). At peak hours actual travel time is over half an hour. Mayford has a poor road network that is heavily congested at peak times. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Development will exacerbate this.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		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.	of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic. Worplesdon rail station would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate	No further modification is 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 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.		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.	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	The Council do not see any inconsistency in its approach to identifying sites to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they	No further modification is 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 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).		justify the allocation of the sites.	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10. Also see Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the site can be developed without to the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. 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
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. 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
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1186	Soofia	Mir	GB7	<p>Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1630	Stewart	Mison	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
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB8	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding brownfield sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. In addition it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is seeking to allocate over 50 sites in the existing urban area for development up until 2027, with a significant number of new dwellings, commercial and retail floor space identified within the Town Centre. This proposed site is allocated to be safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p> <p>The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that its approach to identifying sites for development is consistent with national policy, as set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB9	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding brownfield sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. In addition it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is seeking to allocate over 50 sites in the existing urban area for development up until 2027, with a significant number of new dwellings, commercial and retail floor space identified within the Town Centre. This proposed site is allocated to be safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p> <p>The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that its approach to identifying sites for development is consistent with national policy, as set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding brownfield sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. In addition it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is seeking to allocate over 50 sites in the existing urban area for development up until 2027, with a significant number of new dwellings, commercial and retail floor space identified within the Town Centre. This proposed site is allocated to be safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p> <p>The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that its approach to identifying sites for development is consistent with national policy, as set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding brownfield sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. In addition it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is seeking to allocate over 50 sites in the existing urban area for development up until 2027, with a significant number of new dwellings, commercial and retail floor space identified within the Town Centre. This proposed site is allocated to be safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p> <p>The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council believes that its approach to identifying sites for development is consistent with national policy, as set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB14	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding brownfield sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. In addition it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is seeking to allocate over 50 sites in the existing urban area for development up until 2027, with a significant number of new dwellings, commercial and retail floor space identified within the Town Centre. This proposed site is allocated to be safeguarded for future development needs post 2027.</p> <p>The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that its approach to identifying sites for development is consistent with national policy, as set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB7	It is a requirement that urban sites are considered before Green Belt and WBC have not followed this policy. There is doubt whether there are no alternative sites in the borough.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	General	Understand that WBC is required to find sites for 500+ homes from 2027 but to put all the development in one location makes no sense.	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. The proposed Green Belt sites will be in addition to identified sites within the existing urban area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB8	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the developments will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB9	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the developments will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the developments will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the developments will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB14	Strongly objects to housing proposals. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the developments will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	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
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB8	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB9	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB14	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	The area is prone to flooding and development will result in severe problems in the future.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	The area is prone to flooding and development will result in severe problems in the future.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB9	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	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.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.  It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB8	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	The full impact of the proposed allocations can only be determined once a proposal has been put forward in terms of a masterplan and setting out the quantum of development. As the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027, these assessments will need to be carried out at the planning application stage. This is set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.  Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	<p>The full impact of the proposed allocations can only be determined once a proposal has been put forward in terms of a masterplan and setting out the quantum of development. As the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027, these assessments will need to be carried out at the planning application stage. This is set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.</p> <p>Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	<p>The full impact of the proposed allocations can only be determined once a proposal has been put forward in terms of a masterplan and setting out the quantum of development. As the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027, these assessments will need to be carried out at the planning application stage. This is set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.</p> <p>Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</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
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB14	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	<p>The proposed site is allocated for green infrastructure and not for development. Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements.</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity</p>	No further modification is 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>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1630	Stewart	Mison	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
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	Saunders Lane is too narrow with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	Saunders Lane is too narrow with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>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>	No further modification is 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>Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB8	As with transport, how are the Council and other agencies determining medical, policing and fire infrastructure to support development. Existing medical facilities have long waits for an appointment whilst the police are stretched.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources</p>	No further modification is 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 capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	The site is used as public amenity space from the local and wider community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	The site is used as public amenity space from the local and wider community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB8	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB9	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB10	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB11	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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
1630	Stewart	Mison	GB14	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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
1631	Lyn	Mison	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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition, the presentation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>As set out in Section 1.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is currently carrying out a process of identifying sites within the existing urban area and the Green Belt as set out within the Core Strategy and agreed by the Inspector for the Secretary of State. The Council also believe that the Site Allocations DPD process is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition, the presentation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</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
				effecting the selection of sites.		As set out in Section 1.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is currently carrying out a process of identifying sites within the existing urban area and the Green Belt as set out within the Core Strategy and agreed by the Inspector for the Secretary of State. The Council also believe that the Site Allocations DPD process is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition, the presentation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>As set out in Section 1.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is currently carrying out a process of identifying sites within the existing urban area and the Green Belt as set out within the Core Strategy and agreed by the Inspector for the Secretary of State. The Council also believe that the Site Allocations DPD process is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition, the presentation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>As set out in Section 1.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is currently carrying out a process of identifying sites within the existing urban area and the Green Belt as set out within the Core Strategy and agreed by the Inspector for the Secretary of State. The Council also believe that the Site Allocations DPD process is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	Has a proper brownfield and greenfield review been carried out? If so, it has ignored the Government's guidelines on the use of Brownfield land. The sites selected for development are owned by a developer or family keen to sell, which is effecting the selection of sites.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>In addition, the presentation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0.</p> <p>As set out in Section 1.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is currently carrying out a process of identifying sites within the existing urban area and the Green Belt as set out within the Core Strategy and agreed by the Inspector for the Secretary of State. The Council also believe that the Site Allocations DPD process is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB7	It is a requirement that urban sites are considered before Green Belt and WBC have not followed this policy. There is doubt whether there are no alternative sites in the borough.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	General	Understand that WBC is required to find sites for 500+ homes from 2027 but to put all the development in one location makes no sense.	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. The proposed Green Belt sites will be in addition to identified sites within the existing urban area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure.	None stated.	The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.  The representation regarding the 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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure.	None stated.	The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.  The representation regarding the 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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	Objects to the release of Green Belt land in Mayford. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Mayford. No consideration to the impact on infrastructure.	None stated.	The representation regarding the separation between Mayford and Woking has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.  The representation regarding the 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
1631	Lyn	Mison	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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	The area is prone to flooding and development will result in severe problems in the future.	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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	The area is prone to flooding and development will result in severe problems in the future.	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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	The area is prone to flooding and development will result in severe problems in the future.	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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	The area is prone to flooding and development will result in severe problems in the future.	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
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	The area is prone to flooding and development will result in severe problems in the future.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed allocation of GB14 is for Green Infrastructure purposes and not for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	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.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.  It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	The full impact of the proposed allocations can only be determined once a proposal has been put forward in terms of a masterplan and setting out the quantum of development. As the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027, these assessments will need to be carried out at the planning application stage. This is set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.  Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	<p>The full impact of the proposed allocations can only be determined once a proposal has been put forward in terms of a masterplan and setting out the quantum of development. As the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027, these assessments will need to be carried out at the planning application stage. This is set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.</p> <p>Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	<p>The full impact of the proposed allocations can only be determined once a proposal has been put forward in terms of a masterplan and setting out the quantum of development. As the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027, these assessments will need to be carried out at the planning application stage. This is set out in the key requirements for the site in the DPD.</p> <p>Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues 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
						Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	No environmental or ecological impact studies have been published. Other land in the borough with infrastructure and local transport have been identified in the report.	None stated.	<p>The proposed site is allocated for green infrastructure and not for development. Nevertheless, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It is correct that there are alternative sites in the Borough that could be allocated for development. The Council has considered these and set out a response in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	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. Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	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. Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	
1631	Lyn	Mison	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. Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	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. Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>a 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> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	
1631	Lyn	Mison	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. Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p> <p>It should also be noted that this proposed allocation is not for development but for Green Infrastructure purposes.</p> <p>The representation regarding the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB7	Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	Saunders Lane is too narrow with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	Saunders Lane is too narrow with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	Saunders Lane is too narrow with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	Saunders Lane is too narrow with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	Saunders Lane is too narrow with no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to</p>	No further modification is 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>work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency</p>	No further modification is 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>services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in including healthcare and policing.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process, the Council has consulted with the relevant emergency services to determine what impact of the proposed allocations would have on their services. The new Woking Fire Station is currently under construction in Woking Town Centre. As stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, further development in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of the Fire Service.</p> <p>The Police service have also been consulted during the consultation period. Again as noted in the IDP, growth in the Borough is not expected to have a significant impact on police resources or capacity. Calculating police capacity is complex and is not based on population growth but other factors including the types of homes being built and their location.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the relevant emergency services to determine the impact of the proposals on the services they provide. This will make sure that both existing and future residents will have access to key emergency services.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	The site is used as public amenity space from the local and wider community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	The site is used as public amenity space from the local and wider community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	The site is used as public amenity space from the local and wider community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	The site is used as public amenity space from the local and wider community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	The site is used as public amenity space from the local and wider community.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB8	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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 allocations in the DPD state that the development will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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>	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB9	<p>Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.</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 allocations in the DPD state that the development will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB10	<p>Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.</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 allocations in the DPD state that the development will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB11	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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 allocations in the DPD state that the development will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1631	Lyn	Mison	GB14	Additional homes as well as the school will make the situation worse on the A320. This will result in gridlock and has not been discussed in consultation with the community. The narrow bridges will also create pinch-points. WBC state that no significant traffic impact studies have been carried out as it is the responsibility of the County Council. Using computerised modelling and small traffic survey any disruption could be mitigated. This is not good enough data on which to make such fundamental and environmentally changing decisions.	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 allocations in the DPD state that the development will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1411	Maria	Mistretta	GB12	Objects to the development of houses on this Green Belt land.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1411	Maria	Mistretta	GB13	Objects to the development of houses on this Green Belt land.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	General	Government advice to Council's is to protect Green Belt land.	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
801	Ian	Mitchell	General	Strongly object to housing on sites in Mayford.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	General	Sajid Javid MP states that there is no need to build on Green Belt to meet housing targets. It should therefore be protected and there are alternative sites to use for housing.	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
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to</p>	No further modification is 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>	
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	General	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on the quality of life of those in Mayford and Woking as a whole. 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB9	Development of the garden centre would be a loss to the community	None stated.	The key requirements for the allocation note that existing local business must be relocated. This will prevent the loss of employment opportunities in the Borough as well as make sure local residents have access to this service. In addition, the allocation states that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development on the site to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic on an already over-stressed network. 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.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic on an already over-stressed network. 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.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic on an already over-stressed network. 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.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic on an already over-stressed network. 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.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB8	There is a clear ribbon development from London towards Guildford and Mayford is within this path. The purpose and intent of Green Belt should be maintained and resist the pressure to develop it. (Image attached to show development from London). Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB10	There is a clear ribbon development from London towards Guildford and Mayford is within this path. The purpose and intent of Green Belt should be maintained and resist the pressure to develop it. (Image attached to show development from London). 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	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
				settlement or retaining its character.			
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB11	There is a clear ribbon development from London towards Guildford and Mayford is within this path. The purpose and intent of Green Belt should be maintained and resist the pressure to develop it. (Image attached to show development from London). Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB14	There is a clear ribbon development from London towards Guildford and Mayford is within this path. The purpose and intent of Green Belt should be maintained and resist the pressure to develop it. (Image attached to show development from London). Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB8	Development pressure should be resisted to protect the Green Belt. The existing infrastructure is already failing to cope.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB10	Development pressure should be resisted to protect the Green Belt. The existing infrastructure is already failing to cope.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB11	Development pressure should be resisted to protect the Green Belt. The existing infrastructure is already failing to cope.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
801	Ian	Mitchell	GB14	Development pressure should be resisted to protect the Green Belt. The existing infrastructure is already failing to cope.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB9	Object to housing development on the sites due to over development of a semi-rural area. Development out of proportion to existing character, density and appearance of the village.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.  The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.  Regarding the representation regarding 'mixed appearance', the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027. At this stage there is no masterplan, drawings or plans indicating the appearance. Nevertheless the Council has robust design and character policies in place to make sure new development is of the highest standards.  Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB10	Object to housing development on the sites due to over development of a semi-rural area. Development out of proportion to existing character, density and appearance of the village.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Regarding the representation regarding 'mixed appearance', the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027. At this stage there is no masterplan, drawings or plans indicating the appearance. Nevertheless the Council has robust design and character policies in place to make sure new development is of the highest standards.</p> <p>Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB10	Object to housing development on the sites due to over development of a semi-rural area. Development out of proportion to existing character, density and appearance of the village.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Regarding the representation regarding 'mixed appearance', the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027. At this stage there is no masterplan, drawings or plans indicating the appearance. Nevertheless the Council has robust design and character policies in place to make sure new development is of the highest standards.</p> <p>Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB9	Reconsider your plans. Please also refer to the Mayford Village Society response.	I urge you to 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
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB10	Reconsider your plans. Please also refer to the Mayford Village Society response.	I urge you to 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
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB11	Reconsider your plans. Please also refer to the Mayford Village Society response.	I urge you to 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
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB9	Mayford is being sacrificed for the Borough. The road network is not suitable for more development and	I urge you to reconsider	It should be noted that Mayford is one of several areas within the Borough where the Council has identified sites suitable for development needs. As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, there are over 70 development sites in total. In terms of Green Belt sites, the Council has	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 already at capacity.	your plans.	<p>identified land in Brookwood, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Byfleet as well as Mayford.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB10	Mayford is being sacrificed for the Borough. The road network is not suitable for more development and is already at capacity.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	<p>It should be noted that Mayford is one of several areas within the Borough where the Council has identified sites suitable for development needs. As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, there are over 70 development sites in total. In terms of Green Belt sites, the Council has identified land in Brookwood, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Byfleet as well as Mayford.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB11	Mayford is being sacrificed for the Borough. The road network is not suitable for more development and is already at capacity.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	<p>It should be noted that Mayford is one of several areas within the Borough where the Council has identified sites suitable for development needs. As set out in the draft Site Allocations DPD, there are over 70 development sites in total. In terms of Green Belt sites, the Council has identified land in Brookwood, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Byfleet as well as Mayford.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB9	The case for exceptional circumstances has not been proven.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB10	The case for exceptional circumstances has not been proven.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB11	The case for exceptional circumstances has not been proven.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB9	Disregards the purposes of the Green Belt including maintain space between settlements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB10	Disregards the purposes of the Green Belt including maintain space between settlements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
886	Rosemary	Mitchell	GB11	Disregards the purposes of the Green Belt including maintain space between settlements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB9	Object to housing development on the sites. Contributes to the semi-rural nature of Mayford which would be lost.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to</p>	No further modification is 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>highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Regarding the representation regarding 'mixed appearance', the site is proposed to be safeguarded for development needs post 2027. At this stage there is no masterplan, drawings or plans indicating the appearance. Nevertheless the Council has robust design and character policies in place to make sure new development is of the highest standards.</p> <p>Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB10	Object to housing development on the sites. Contributes to the semi-rural nature of Mayford which would be lost.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the loss of Green Belt land and the Council's decision to identify land for development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB11	Object to housing development on the sites. Contributes to the semi-rural nature of Mayford which would be lost.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the loss of Green Belt land and the Council's decision to identify land for development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB9	Reconsider your plans. Please also refer to the Mayford Village Society response.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representer ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB10	Reconsider your plans. Please also refer to the Mayford Village Society response.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representer ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB11	Reconsider your plans. Please also refer to the Mayford Village Society response.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representer ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB9	Mayford taking the brunt of the Borough's housing development.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	<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
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB10	Mayford taking the brunt of the Borough's housing development.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	<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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Borough, 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.	
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB11	Mayford taking the brunt of the Borough's housing development.	I urge you to reconsider your plans.	<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
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB9	Does not agree there is an exceptional circumstances case.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB10	Does not agree there is an exceptional circumstances case.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB11	Does not agree there is an exceptional circumstances case.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB9	The scale of new properties will change the character of Mayford. There will be gridlock from the new cars.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB10	The scale of new properties will change the character of Mayford. There will be gridlock from the new cars.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB11	The scale of new properties will change the character of Mayford. There will be gridlock from the new cars.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB9	Wildlife will be disturbed and lost. Horse rides will become dangerous.	I urge you to 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 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 note the representation regarding horse riding. At the Development Management stage of any proposed scheme, all road users will be considered as part of a Transport Assessment. This will be taken into account by Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB10	Wildlife will be disturbed and lost. Horse rides will become dangerous.	I urge you to 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 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 note the representation regarding horse riding. At the Development Management stage of any proposed scheme, all road users will be considered as part of a Transport Assessment. This will be taken into account by Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
887	Roger	Mitchell	GB11	Wildlife will be disturbed and lost. Horse rides will become dangerous.	I urge you to 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 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 note the representation regarding horse riding. At the Development Management stage of any proposed scheme, all road users will be considered as part of a Transport Assessment. This will be taken into account by Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB9	<p>Concerned about drainage. There doesn't appear to be any improvements proposed to manage any exiting flooding issues on the Lane e.g. flooding of several houses last year.</p> <p>Additional houses, hard standing etc will make flooding issues worse</p>	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding and drainage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 particularly paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB10	<p>Concerned about drainage. There doesn't appear to be any improvements proposed to manage any exiting flooding issues on the Lane e.g. flooding of several houses last year.</p> <p>Additional houses, hard standing etc will make flooding issues worse</p>	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding and drainage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 particularly paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB11	<p>Concerned about drainage. There doesn't appear to be any improvements proposed to manage any exiting flooding issues on the Lane e.g. flooding of several houses last year.</p> <p>Additional houses, hard standing etc will make flooding</p>	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding and drainage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 particularly paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				issues worse			
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB14	Concerned about drainage. There doesn't appear to be any improvements proposed to manage any exiting flooding issues on the Lane e.g. flooding of several houses last year.  Additional houses, hard standing etc will make flooding issues worse	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding and drainage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 particularly paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB8	Concerned about drainage. There doesn't appear to be any improvements proposed to manage any exiting flooding issues on the Lane e.g. flooding of several houses last year.  Additional houses, hard standing etc will make flooding issues worse	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding and drainage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 particularly paragraph 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB8	Object to proposals for Mayford. Proposals will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, and lead to the coalescence of Woking and Guildford.  There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to 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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB9	Object to proposals for Mayford. Proposals will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, and lead to the coalescence of Woking and Guildford.  There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to 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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB10	Object to proposals for Mayford. Proposals will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, and lead to the coalescence of Woking and Guildford.  There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to 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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB11	Object to proposals for Mayford. Proposals will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, and lead to the coalescence of Woking and Guildford.  There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to 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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB14	Object to proposals for Mayford. Proposals will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, and lead to the coalescence of Woking and Guildford.  There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to 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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB8	There appears to be no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from the proposals. More people mean more strain on the existing insufficient road network. Existing roads are narrow, contain few pavements, single lane bridges and is often congested.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB9	There appears to be no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from the proposals. More people mean more strain on the existing insufficient road network. Existing roads are narrow, contain few pavements, single lane bridges and is often congested.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB10	There appears to be no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from the proposals.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				More people mean more strain on the existing insufficient road network. Existing roads are narrow, contain few pavements, single lane bridges and is often congested.		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.	of this representation
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB11	There appears to be no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from the proposals. More people mean more strain on the existing insufficient road network. Existing roads are narrow, contain few pavements, single lane bridges and is often congested.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB14	There appears to be no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from the proposals. More people mean more strain on the existing insufficient road network. Existing roads are narrow, contain few pavements, single lane bridges and is often congested.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB8	The special character of Mayford is why people have chosen to live here. It is a unique village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals would destroy Mayford Village	Reconsider plans	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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB9	The special character of Mayford is why people have chosen to live here. It is a unique village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals would destroy Mayford Village	Reconsider plans	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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB10	The special character of Mayford is why people have chosen to live here. It is a unique village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals would destroy Mayford Village	Reconsider plans	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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB11	The special character of Mayford is why people have chosen to live here. It is a unique village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals would destroy Mayford Village	Reconsider plans	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
1222	Deborah	Moir	GB14	The special character of Mayford is why people have chosen to live here. It is a unique village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals would destroy Mayford Village	Reconsider plans	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						7.5	
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	GB7	A sequential approach must be undertaken to identify suitable sites. No urban sites have been considered and there is doubt to the validity of no other sites in the borough being identified or suitable. Mayford does not have good access to jobs, infrastructure or services and therefore does not satisfy the sequential approach criteria.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford	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
				merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.		<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>	
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed leisure centre, running track and other facilities. These are inappropriate development within a residential area and do not meet the Council's own stated 800m separation policy.	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				settlement or retaining its character.		protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning</p>	No further modification is 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>application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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>	
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	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</p>	No further modification is 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>Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	General	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	The additional visits per week will have negative impact on an already overloaded road network whilst the public transport in the area is dire.	None stated.	<p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	The hours of operation will have a major impact on residents and surrounding local area. It is inappropriate and shows a clear lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.  The Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Mayford area. It is 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>	
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for residents including space for business activities. These activities are out of keeping in this location due to the proximity of houses and heritage assets.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	Accept that the proposed secondary school represents a special circumstance for development in the Green Belt, and I support the mitigation measures noted for the school.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1645	Colin	Moir	GB9	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1645	Colin	Moir	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
1591	Ron	Mole	General	Would like this site to be considered as part of the Site Allocations DPD process.	Include the proposed site within the DPD.	<p>The suggested new site for residential development is noted by the Council. The propose site lies within Parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review, of which a significant amount is recommended to be released from the Green Belt. The draft Site Allocations DPD seeks to safeguard four sites within this area for residential development needs post 2027. The suggested site put forward within the representation is not within any of the proposed safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Consequently, this site has been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the proposed use suggested in the representation and based on the evidence, the Council's view is that the site is not suitable for residential development. This is set out in the SA.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1591	Ron	Mole	General	The site is on Egley Road and extends to 2.981 acres.	None stated.	<p>The suggested new site for residential development is noted by the Council. The propose site lies within Parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review, of which a significant amount is recommended to be released from the Green Belt. The draft Site Allocations DPD seeks to safeguard four sites within this area for residential development needs post 2027. The suggested site put forward within the representation is not within any of the proposed safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Consequently, this site has been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the proposed use suggested in the representation and based on the evidence, the Council's view is that the site is not suitable for residential development. This is set out in the SA.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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>	No further modification is 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 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.	
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB7	A sequential approach must be undertaken to identify suitable sites. No urban sites have been considered and there is doubt to the validity of no other sites in the borough being identified or suitable. Mayford does not have good access to jobs, infrastructure or services and therefore does not satisfy the sequential approach criteria.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.		<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>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed leisure centre, running track and other facilities. These are inappropriate development within a residential area and do not meet the Council's own stated 800m separation policy.	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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>	
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	The additional visits per week will have negative impact on an already overloaded road network whilst the public transport in the area is dire.	None stated.	<p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	The hours of operation will have a major impact on residents and surrounding local area. It is inappropriate and shows a clear lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	<p>As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.</p> <p>The Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Woking.		enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much	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	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
				longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.		<p>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.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy</p>	No further modification is 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 supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.		access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for residents including space for business activities. These activities are out of keeping in this location due to the proximity of houses and heritage assets.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	Accept that the proposed secondary school represents a special circumstance for development in the Green Belt, and I support the mitigation measures noted for the school.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB9	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
1639	M	Moloney-McConville	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
60	R O	Moore	GB12	Object to the proposal to build over 400 dwellings in the Upshot Lane area. Pyrford cannot cope with the increase in traffic that would be caused by this development - there are already bottlenecks for traffic leaving Pyrford, at the Anchor and Newark Lane, Ripley. Parked cars outside Pyrford School and Church often reduce the road to a single lane.	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
60	R O	Moore	GB12	These fields are used for spreading sewage sludge, health considerations mean that only certain fields (e.g. those growing a biofuel crop) can be used for this process and their loss would cause a local shortage of suitable land for sewage sludge disposal.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The collective evidence of the Council justifies the allocation of the sites to meet future housing needs. It is possible to find an alternative site for spreading sewage sludge.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
60	R O	Moore	GB13	Object to the proposal to build over 400 dwellings in the Upshot Lane area. Pyrford cannot cope with the increase in traffic that would be caused by this development - there are already bottlenecks for traffic leaving Pyrford, at the Anchor and Newark Lane, Ripley. Parked cars outside Pyrford School and Church often reduce the road to a single lane.	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
60	R O	Moore	GB13	These fields are used for spreading sewage sludge, health considerations mean that only certain fields (e.g. those growing a biofuel crop) can be used for this process and their loss would cause a local shortage of suitable land for sewage sludge disposal.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The collective evidence of the Council justifies the allocation of the sites to meet future housing needs. It is possible to find an alternative site for spreading sewage sludge.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB7	Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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>	
873	I	Moore	GB11	Little consideration given to local wildlife. 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
873	I	Moore	GB14	Little consideration given to local wildlife. 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
873	I	Moore	GB9	Little consideration given to local wildlife. 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. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied the allocation of development sites in the area will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the draft allocations. 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 on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p>	
873	I	Moore	GB10	Little consideration given to local wildlife. 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. 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 is satisfied the allocation of development sites in the area will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the draft allocations. 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 on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB7	Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes.	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.</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
873	I	Moore	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



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
873	I	Moore	GB9	The local road network, with two single lane traffic bridges, will not cope more traffic from additional homes and will impact major roads. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
873	I	Moore	GB10	The local road network, with two single lane traffic bridges, will not cope more traffic from additional homes and will impact major roads. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
873	I	Moore	GB11	The local road network, with two single lane traffic bridges, will not cope more traffic from additional homes and will impact major roads. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 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>	
873	I	Moore	GB14	<p>The local road network, with two single lane traffic bridges, will not cope more traffic from additional homes and will impact major roads.</p> <p>The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.</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 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
873	I	Moore	GB8	An EIA has not considered the impact of light and noise pollution from the loss of the tree line, which is legally required.	None stated.	The proposed school on this site was required to carry out an EIA. This is set out on the Council's website. The EIA did consider the impact of light pollution and noise pollution as a result of the development. This is consistent with the relevant legislation. 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
873	I	Moore	GB14	Ignores the environmental and health effects from pollution arising from additional traffic.	None stated.	The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling to and from the site. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of improved accessibility to open space by walking and cycling should be incorporated into the scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB9	Ignores the environmental and health effects from pollution arising from additional traffic.	None stated.	The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle links are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
873	I	Moore	GB10	Ignores the environmental and health effects from pollution arising from additional traffic.	None stated.	The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that there is the potential for the development to create new pedestrian and cycle links within and around the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB11	Ignores the environmental and health effects from pollution arising from additional traffic.	None stated.	The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that there is the potential for the development to create new pedestrian and cycle links within and around the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB9	Egley Road area floods during bad weather. Development on the Green Belt will affect the water table level and increase flooding. There is insufficient infrastructure in place to deal with the increase in ground water.	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
873	I	Moore	GB10	Egley Road area floods during bad weather. Development on the Green Belt will affect the water table level and increase flooding. There is insufficient infrastructure in place to deal with the increase in ground water.	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
873	I	Moore	GB11	Egley Road area floods during bad weather. Development on the Green Belt will affect the water table level and increase flooding. There is insufficient infrastructure in place to deal with the increase in ground water.	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
873	I	Moore	GB14	Egley Road area floods during bad weather. Development on the Green Belt will affect the water table level and increase flooding. There is insufficient infrastructure in place to deal with the increase in ground water.	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
873	I	Moore	GB9	Insufficient evidence to show the Council has considered all brownfield sites this is contrary to government requirements. Removing the Green Belt between Mayford and Woking will infill the green space separating them, merging them together. This increased to risk of Woking merging with Guildford, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding use of brownfield land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>The issue of the merging of Woking and Mayford has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB10	Insufficient evidence to show the Council has considered all brownfield sites this is contrary to government requirements. Removing the Green Belt between Mayford and Woking will infill the green space separating them, merging them together. This increased to risk of Woking merging with Guildford, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding use of brownfield land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>The issue of the merging of Woking and Mayford has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB11	Insufficient evidence to show the Council has considered all brownfield sites this is contrary to government requirements. Removing the Green Belt between Mayford and Woking will infill the green space separating them, merging them together. This increased to risk of Woking merging with Guildford, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding use of brownfield land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>The issue of the merging of Woking and Mayford has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB14	Insufficient evidence to show the Council has considered all brownfield sites this is contrary to government requirements. Removing the Green Belt between Mayford and Woking will infill the green space separating them, merging them together. This increased to risk of Woking merging with Guildford, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding use of brownfield land has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>The issue of the merging of Woking and Mayford has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						separation between the town and Guildford.	
873	I	Moore	GB7	No justification for increasing pitch numbers on the site. Does not take into account government guidelines and due processes for preserving the Green Belt, gives the guidance paper (6 October 2014) as an example.	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
873	I	Moore	GB9	Additional infrastructure has not been included in the plans, therefore more land is going to be required to provide infrastructure for Mayford. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support the level of new homes. The GBBR is wrong, there are very limited local facilities which will not support the proposed level of population increase. Lack of local facilities will result in even more from new residents travelling to Woking and Guildford town centres. There is insufficient social infrastructure to support additional residents.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB10	Additional infrastructure has not been included in the plans, therefore more land is going to be required to provide infrastructure for Mayford. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support the level of new homes. The GBBR is wrong, there are very limited local facilities which will not support the proposed level of population increase. Lack of local facilities will result in even more from new residents travelling to Woking and Guildford town centres. There is insufficient social infrastructure to support additional residents.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB11	Additional infrastructure has not been included in the plans, therefore more land is going to be required to provide infrastructure for Mayford. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support the level of new homes. The GBBR is wrong, there are very limited local facilities which will not support the proposed level of population increase. Lack of local facilities will result in even more from new residents travelling to Woking and Guildford town centres. There is insufficient social infrastructure to support additional residents.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB14	Additional infrastructure has not been included in the plans, therefore more land is going to be required to provide infrastructure for Mayford. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support the level of new homes. The GBBR is wrong, there are very limited local facilities which will not support the proposed level of population increase. Lack of local facilities will result in even more from new residents travelling to Woking and Guildford town centres. There is insufficient social infrastructure to support additional residents.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.  In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
873	I	Moore	GB7	Strongly object to an increase in pitches on this site. No justification for loss of Green Belt for pitches.	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
873	I	Moore	GB8	Responded via the Mayford Society. Accept provision of a new school provided access and infrastructure concerns are met.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a new school, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
873	I	Moore	GB9	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and its surroundings. 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
873	I	Moore	GB10	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and its surroundings. 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
873	I	Moore	GB11	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and its surroundings. 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
873	I	Moore	GB14	Reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village and its surroundings. 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
873	I	Moore	GB8	New dwellings contradict reasons given for the need for a new school – to provide for current population not to support an increased population.	None stated.	<p>The need for a secondary school is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). This takes into account existing school capacities as well as forecasted growth from across the Borough. The proposed school on the site is expected to significantly contribute towards education provision in the Borough for both existing and future residents.</p> <p>The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1129	George	Moore	GB13	I object. The Borough has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's letters raising concerns about the Green Belt Review. The Borough Executive decided to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. Unacceptable that Woking Borough Council has substantially departed from their own independent advisers recommendations concerning Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it has to balance that with its clear need to meet the development needs if the area. The approach taken to use the Green Belt boundary review to inform the DPD is set out in detail in Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1129	George	Moore	GB12	I object. The Borough has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's letters raising concerns about the Green Belt Review. The Borough Executive decided to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. Unacceptable that Woking Borough Council has substantially departed from their own independent advisers recommendations concerning Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the community. It will continue to take account of public opinion. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites that are being proposed. This matter is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1129	George	Moore	GB12	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock. Housing development in Guildford Borough will worsen. This plan will impose massive traffic increase from the south passing through Pyrford to West Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The	No further modification is 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>general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
1129	George	Moore	GB13	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock. Housing development in Guildford Borough will worsen. This plan will impose massive traffic increase from the south passing through Pyrford to West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1129	George	Moore	GB12	Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural landscape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough. It values its village status and has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	<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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1129	George	Moore	GB13	Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural landscape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough. It values its village status and has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	<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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1129	George	Moore	GB12	The plan will have an ecological impact on water, sewerage and other infrastructure. Water pressure already poor in some parts of Pyrford. More school and elderly care places needed. Nursery and pre school already at capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1129	George	Moore	GB13	The plan will have an ecological impact on water, sewerage and other infrastructure. Water pressure already poor in some parts of Pyrford. More school and elderly care places needed. Nursery and pre school already at capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB12	433 new houses will create a massive need for school places in 2030. Nursery and pre school facilities already at capacity. More elderly care facilities will be needed.	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
1147	Janet	Moore	GB13	433 new houses will create a massive need for school places in 2030. Nursery and pre school facilities already at capacity. More elderly care facilities will be needed.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB12	I object. The Council has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's letters raising concerns about the Green Belt Review. The Borough Executive decided to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. Unacceptable that Woking Borough Council has substantially departed from their own independent advisers recommendations concerning Pyrford.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the community. It will continue to take account of public opinion. However, it will have to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The Council has used a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites that are being proposed. This matter is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB13	I object. The Borough has ignored Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's letters raising concerns about the Green Belt Review. The Borough Executive decided to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. Unacceptable that Woking Borough Council has substantially departed from their own independent advisers recommendations concerning Pyrford.	None stated.	The council has not ignored the views of local residents. However it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The Council use a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively the justify the allocation of the proposals. The manners in which the Green Belt boundary review has been used to inform the DPD is comprehensively addressed in Section 17 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB12	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock. Housing development in Guildford Borough will worsen. This plan will impose massive traffic increase from	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will	No further modification is 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 south passing through Pyrford to West Byfleet.		comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1147	Janet	Moore	GB13	Pyrford central village is already congested. 433 new houses will increase already unacceptable congestion, perhaps gridlock. Housing development in Guildford Borough will worsen. This plan will impose massive traffic increase from the south passing through Pyrford to West Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB12	It has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The collective evidence of the Council supports the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1147	Janet	Moore	GB13	It has well-maintained historic buildings and conservation areas. Removal of Green Belt could irreparably damage these assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB13	Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural landscape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough. It values its village status	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
1147	Janet	Moore	GB12	Pyrford's charm and character, maintaining the natural landscape, views and footpaths are important. Pyrford is unique in its unspoilt countryside, an asset for the borough. It values its village status	None stated.	The Council accepts the character of Pyrford is distinctive to be protected. However, it is satisfied that it will not be compromised by the proposals. The landscape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB12	The plan will have an ecological impact on water, sewerage and other infrastructure. Water pressure already poor in some parts of Pyrford. More school and elderly care places needed. Nursery and pre school already at capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites. In addition, the Council has robust policies such as the introduction of Su to minimise the of the proposals on water and sewerage infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1147	Janet	Moore	GB13	The plan will have an ecological impact on water, sewerage and other infrastructure. Water pressure already poor in some parts of Pyrford. More school and elderly care places needed. Nursery and pre school already at capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The	No further modification is 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 has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB4	If the Green Belt is released we will have no open space to enjoy, as the rural surroundings we chose to live in when we came to Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). This means that the majority of Byfleet's open space (which is designated as Green Belt) will remain.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB5	If the Green Belt is released we will have no open space to enjoy, as the rural surroundings we chose to live in when we came to Byfleet.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). This means that the majority of Byfleet's open space (which is designated as Green Belt) will remain.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB4	The A245 runs through the middle of the village, and is already congested particularly when there is a problem on the M25 and A3.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB5	The A245 runs through the middle of the village, and is already congested particularly when there is a problem on the M25 and A3.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB4	Infrastructure needs to be addressed before any further developments are considered.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB5	Infrastructure needs to be addressed before any further developments are considered.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB4	Flooding is a major concern. Without replacing any further pipes, the drainage system is already under stress.	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 and also paragraph 3.10. 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
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB5	Flooding is a major concern. Without replacing any further pipes, the drainage system is already under stress.	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 and also paragraph 3.10. 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
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB4	Objects to further development in Byfleet, we are at saturation point and the Green Belt is under threat again.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB5	Objects to further development in Byfleet, we are at saturation point and the Green Belt is under threat again.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB4	Understands the need for extra housing, and suggests that empty office blocks in Woking town centre and Byfleet village could be converted into apartments. This would cost less financially as much of the work has been done, and there is sewage and water services already in place. This way the Green Belt could remain intact for all the enjoy.	Suggests that empty office blocks in Woking town centre and Byfleet village are converted into apartments, and the Green Belt left intact.	Many of these sites will already be allocated as part of the draft DPD, or will have been assessed as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and/or Employment Land Review (available on the Council's website). More detail on the assessment of alternative sites, including offices on brownfield land, is available in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Section 8.0 gives further information on the draft DPD's evidence base.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1517	P.F.	Moore	GB5	Understands the need for extra housing, and suggests that empty office blocks in Woking town centre and Byfleet village could be converted into apartments. This would cost less financially as much of the work has been done, and there is sewage and water services already in place. This way the Green Belt could remain intact for all the enjoy.	Suggests that empty office blocks in Woking town centre and Byfleet village are converted into apartments, and the Green Belt left intact.	Many of these sites will already be allocated as part of the draft DPD, or will have been assessed as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and/or Employment Land Review (available on the Council's website). More detail on the assessment of alternative sites, including offices on brownfield land, is available in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Section 8.0 gives further information on the draft DPD's evidence base.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB12	Pyrford is already extremely congested during the day especially Coldharbour Road. Additional housing will exacerbate and extend the problem onto surrounding roads	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB13	Pyrford is already extremely congested during the day especially Coldharbour Road. Additional housing will exacerbate and extend the problem onto surrounding roads	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
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB12	Countryside must be preserved or Pyrford will be spoilt forever	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB13	Countryside must be preserved or Pyrford will be spoilt forever	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB12	The character and charm of Pyrford is important . The removal of the two parcels in Pyrford will have a detrimental effect on its special character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0</p> <p>In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB13	The character and charm of Pyrford is important . The removal of the two parcels in Pyrford will have a detrimental effect on its special character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0</p> <p>In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB12	Local infrastructure (schools) and amenities (shops) are already oversubscribed.	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
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB13	Local infrastructure (schools) and amenities (shops) are already oversubscribed.	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
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB12	Proposals will create significant noise and disruption for residents for a lengthy period	None stated.	<p>Proposals will be required to meet all other Development Plan policies and relevant guidance. Including Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, emerging Development Management Policies, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. These include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites avoid significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution.</p> <p>The Council has powers to control noise as a result of construction sites if considered to be significant and in excess of noise guidelines.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB13	Proposals will create significant noise and disruption for residents for a lengthy period	None stated.	Proposals will be required to meet all other Development Plan policies and relevant guidance. Including Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, emerging Development Management Policies, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. These include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites avoid significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution.  The Council has powers to control noise as a result of construction sites if considered to be significant and in excess of noise guidelines.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB12	Object to 400 homes in the GB in Pyrford	None stated.	The objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1252	Jason, Kate	Moors	GB13	Object to 400 homes in the GB in Pyrford	None stated.	The objection is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB11	Various comments made regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review. Concerns raised regarding the Escarpment and whether it is a defensible boundary can be achieved.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 10.0, 12.0, 17.0 and 23.0.  Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.  The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB8	Mayford Neighbourhood Centre has one shop. The Town Centre from here is not suitable cycling distance. This information should be corrected in the document	None stated.	Mayford Neighbourhood Centre is a designated centre.  As part of these site specific measures, the 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB22	Objects to the assessment of GB22 with regards to health objectives and economic objectives. Does not consider these to be accurate.	None stated.	The data has been used in estimating the sustainability of sites and has been consistently assessed within the SA. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	UA32	The representation queries the scores given for the various sustainability objectives for the site.	None stated.	The comments column of the sustainability appraisal table comprehensively explains why the site assessments have awarded the scores they have.  The SA objectives has been assessed consistently for other sites.  The proposed allocation includes provision for open space, leisure and recreational facilities and is close to local services and facilities. The short term score is negative to account for the loss of facilities in the short term.  The site is a designated priority place in the Core Strategy CS5 and according to national statistics, it identifies this postcode location as above average in terms of overall deprivation (England). The Council seeks to implement a number of schemes to make a positive contribution to the area.  The site is well located to a number of services and facilities and is being proposed for community and retail provision in the Site Allocation.  The site is a mixture of previously developed and greenfield land. The redevelopment of the area is considered to be efficient use of land and therefore it has received an overall positive score for the SA objective	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB19	Propose 2 or 3 NEW SANG areas to the north of the railway line & Canal	None stated.	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1334	Louise	Morales	GB20	Propose 2 or 3 NEW SANG areas to the north of the railway line & Canal	None stated.	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB21	Propose 2 or 3 NEW SANG areas to the north of the railway line & Canal	None stated.	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB21	Propose 2 or 3 NEW SANG areas to the north of the railway line & Canal	None stated.	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB22	Propose 2 or 3 NEW SANG areas to the north of the railway line & Canal	None stated.	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. Provided this information is presented to the Council, it will assess the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. However at this time the site can not be considered in further detail until additional information is provided by the representor.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	UA5	Does not support the widescale demolition of areas to accommodate high rise. Considers that this will completely change the character of areas.  The SA assessment for the site, objective 2 and objective 7 should be negative.  Promoting health and wellbeing through adding a requirement for gym facilities. Gym facilities should be provided where sites exceed a certain threshold.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.  The comments column of the sustainability appraisal table comprehensively explain why the site assessments have awarded the scores they have. In relation to objective 2 and 7, the location of the site within the Town Centre and close to services and facilities would have been a key consideration.  The key requirements also requires the comprehensive redevelopment of the site taking into account the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area and its setting.  Improved health is an important concern however there is no provision standard for gym provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	UA6	Does not support the widescale demolition of areas to accommodate high rise. Considers that this will completely change the character of areas.  The SA assessment for the site, objective 2 and objective 7 should be negative.  Promoting health and wellbeing through adding a requirement for gym facilities. Gym facilities should be provided where sites exceed a certain threshold.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.  The comments column of the sustainability appraisal table comprehensively explain why the site assessments have awarded the scores they have. In relation to objective 2 and 7, the location of the site within the Town Centre and close to services and facilities would have been a key consideration.  The key requirements also requires buildings to be of exceptional design quality.  Improved health is an important concern however there is no provision standard for gym provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	UA7	Does not support the widescale demolition of areas to accommodate high rise. Considers that this will completely change the character of areas.  The SA assessment for the site, objective 2 and objective 7 should be negative.  Promoting health and wellbeing through adding a requirement for gym facilities. Gym facilities should be provided where sites exceed a certain threshold.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.  The comments column of the sustainability appraisal table comprehensively explain why the site assessments have awarded the scores they have. In relation to objective 2 and 7, the location of the site within the Town Centre and close to services and facilities would have been a key consideration.  Improved health is an important concern however there is no provision standard for gym	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						provision.	
1334	Louise	Morales	UA8	Does not support the widescale demolition of areas to accommodate high rise. Considers that this will completely change the character of areas.  The SA assessment for the site, objective 2 and objective 7 should be negative.  Promoting health and wellbeing through adding a requirement for gym facilities. Gym facilities should be provided where sites exceed a certain threshold.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.  The comments column of the sustainability appraisal table comprehensively explain why the site assessments have awarded the scores they have. In relation to objective 2 and 7, the location of the site within the Town Centre and close to services and facilities would have been a key consideration.  Improved health is an important concern however there is no provision standard for gym provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	UA9	Does not support the widescale demolition of areas to accommodate high rise. Considers that this will completely change the character of areas.  The SA assessment for the site, objective 2 and objective 7 should be negative.  Promoting health and wellbeing through adding a requirement for gym facilities. Gym facilities should be provided where sites exceed a certain threshold.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.  The comments column of the sustainability appraisal table comprehensively explain why the site assessments have awarded the scores they have. In relation to objective 2 and 7, the location of the site within the Town Centre and close to services and facilities would have been a key consideration.  Improved health is an important concern however there is no provision standard for gym provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	UA10	Does not support the widescale demolition of areas to accommodate high rise. Considers that this will completely change the character of areas.  The SA assessment for the site, objective 2 and objective 7 should be negative.  Promoting health and wellbeing through adding a requirement for gym facilities. Gym facilities should be provided where sites exceed a certain threshold.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 18.0, 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.  The comments column of the sustainability appraisal table comprehensively explain why the site assessments have awarded the scores they have. In relation to objective 2 and 7, the location of the site within the Town Centre and close to services and facilities would have been a key consideration.  Improved health is an important concern however there is no provision standard for gym provision.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	General	There are significant errors in relation to walking times. Also considers there are too many sites within 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB19	Support the identification/provision of SANGs but does not consider there are enough SANGs located north of the Borough.	None stated.	The Council has identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity to cover the entire plan period. It is important to note that the catchment area of SANGs will vary depending on the size of the SANG. This will vary from a radius of 2km to 5km from the SANG. The Council believes that the proposed SANGs are sufficiently located and dispersed to address future development needs proposed for borough.  Also, please note that there are existing SANGs located north of the Town Centre that still have capacity to mitigate against some of the future residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB20	Support the identification/provision of SANGs but does not consider there are enough SANGs located north of the Borough.	None stated.	The Council has identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity to cover the entire plan period. It is important to note that the catchment area of SANGs will vary depending on the size of the SANG. This will vary from a radius of 2km to 5km from the SANG. The Council believes that the proposed SANGs are sufficiently located and dispersed to address future development needs proposed for borough.  Also, please note that there are existing SANGs located north of the Town Centre that still have capacity to mitigate against some of the future residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1334	Louise	Morales	GB21	Support the identification/provision of SANGs but does not consider there are enough SANGs located north of the Borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity to cover the entire plan period. It is important to note that the catchment area of SANGs will vary depending on the size of the SANG. This will vary from a radius of 2km to 5km from the SANG. The Council believes that the proposed SANGs are sufficiently located and dispersed to address future development needs proposed for borough.</p> <p>Also, please note that there are existing SANGs located north of the Town Centre that still have capacity to mitigate against some of the future residential development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB21	Support the identification/provision of SANGs but does not consider there are enough SANGs located north of the Borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity to cover the entire plan period. It is important to note that the catchment area of SANGs will vary depending on the size of the SANG. This will vary from a radius of 2km to 5km from the SANG. The Council believes that the proposed SANGs are sufficiently located and dispersed to address future development needs proposed for borough.</p> <p>Also, please note that there are existing SANGs located north of the Town Centre that still have capacity to mitigate against some of the future residential development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1334	Louise	Morales	GB22	Support the identification/provision of SANGs but does not consider there are enough SANGs located north of the Borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has identified sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity to cover the entire plan period. It is important to note that the catchment area of SANGs will vary depending on the size of the SANG. This will vary from a radius of 2km to 5km from the SANG. The Council believes that the proposed SANGs are sufficiently located and dispersed to address future development needs proposed for borough.</p> <p>Also, please note that there are existing SANGs located north of the Town Centre that still have capacity to mitigate against some of the future residential development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
359	Jack	Morgan	General	Develop new road links in the borough. Particularly between Lockfield Drive and the A319 to improve links to the M3, where currently the route is poor. If Woking seriously want to be considered a business centre it needs better road links	Develop better road links- specifically between Lockfield Drive to the M3	Surrey County Council is the highways authority. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation suggesting a new road.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
359	Jack	Morgan	General	Generally support the rest of the proposals however building on the GB should be the last resort. Redevelop farmland not woodland/forest areas	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
359	Jack	Morgan	General	Consider high density development to the south of the station.	Consider high density development to the south of the station.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
359	Jack	Morgan	UA23	Supports various improvements that have been made in the town however does not support a rail flyover because it will reduce the number of services at Woking and would be unattractive. Suggests building a tunnel instead	Consider building a tunnel instead of a flyover	<p>Support for the recent town centre works and developments is noted.</p> <p>Support for the site redevelopment is noted.</p> <p>Woking Station is one of the busiest stations on the Southwest Trains network, with over 7 million passengers last year. This is highlighted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which state that Woking is an Important intermediate station alongside Clapham Junction, Basingstoke and others. The proposed flyover at site UA23 would, according to the report, would increase capacity on the network and assist in reducing congestion. The combination of Woking Station being classed as an important intermediate station and increasing capacity/the number of trains on the network, should ensure that there is no reduction in the level of service at the station. The Council is committed to working with the train operator and Network Rail in bringing forward improvements to this and all of the Borough's stations.</p> <p>The Council notes the comment regarding the impact of a flyover and the suggestion of a tunnel. This will be considered in further detail when the project is being prepared by the relevant stakeholders.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
359	Jack	Morgan	UA23	Extend the station to the south and add more platforms. Extend tracks to the south, where the car park is located and create a multi- storey there. This would encourage more services to and from Woking. It is important that Woking is better connected to ensure economic growth.	Extend the station to the south and add more platforms. Extend tracks to the south, where the car park is located	<p>There is no doubt that the station and the frequency of the trains to London and neighbouring areas is a significant positive benefit for the town and Borough. The Council is committed to working with the train operator and Network Rail to ensure capacity keeps up with demand. The exact layout and positioning of tracks, platforms and crossovers will be considered in detail by the relevant stakeholders when preparing any improvement works. This will take into account the number of trains serving the station and connectivity to other areas, including Heathrow and other towns.</p> <p>The existing station car park is proposed to be allocated for residential development. See site UA40.</p>	No further modification is 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 create a multi- storey there. Encourage better links to Heathrow	The Council agrees that connectivity is important for local economic growth.	
391	Paula	Morgan	GB4	Reconsider plans, pursue other areas which are better served by roads and public transport designed to cope with a dense population	None stated.	The Council has undertaken a thorough assessment of sites as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
391	Paula	Morgan	GB5	Reconsider plans, pursue other areas which are better served by roads and public transport designed to cope with a dense population	None stated.	The Council has undertaken a thorough assessment of sites as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
391	Paula	Morgan	GB4	Object to the release of land in the Byfleet area. The fields are rich in biodiversity and house a range of animals and birds.  The fields are used as farmland over the winter months, and used for a variety of recreational activities.  The area is steeped in history surrounding Byfleet Manor House	None stated.	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.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation.  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
391	Paula	Morgan	GB5	Object to the release of land in the Byfleet area. The fields are rich in biodiversity and house a range of animals and birds.  The fields are used as farmland over the winter months, and used for a variety of recreational activities.  The area is steeped in history surrounding Byfleet Manor House	None stated.	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.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation.  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
391	Paula	Morgan	GB4	The local road infrastructure could not cope from the increased traffic.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; 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	No further modification is 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 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>	
391	Paula	Morgan	GB5	The local road infrastructure could not cope from the increased 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; 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
391	Paula	Morgan	GB4	The fields have a functional purpose, preventing flooding in the area. Historically Byfleet suffers from flooding and increased development will exacerbate this and will have a knock on effect on insurance	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in 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
391	Paula	Morgan	GB5	The fields have a functional purpose, preventing flooding in the area. Historically Byfleet suffers from flooding and increased development will exacerbate this and will have a knock on effect on insurance	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in 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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	Houses that have been built recently offer little or no affordable housing for young people born in the village. Potential house prices can be kept high.	None stated.	This problem is particularly an issue due to the undersupply of housing, which these proposals seek to address. The allocation includes the requirement for a contribution towards affordable housing, in the case for 50% to be provided on-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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	Houses that have been built recently offer little or no affordable housing for young people born in the village. Potential house prices can be kept high.	None stated.	This problem is particularly an issue due to the undersupply of housing, which these proposals seek to address. The allocation includes the requirement for a contribution towards affordable housing, in the case for 50% to be provided on-site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	The Council have not replied to letters from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum or consulted with them on the issue. It is a big concern that groups like PNF are ignored.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. In terms of how consultation has been carried out, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	The Council have not replied to letters from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum or consulted with them on the issue. It is a big concern that groups like PNF are ignored.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation, and may be why a response has appeared to be delayed. In terms of how consultation has been carried out, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	There is so much history and character in the village, including beautiful countryside, which further development could destroy.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	There is so much history and character in the village, including beautiful countryside, which further development could destroy.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	There is a fear that removing the Green Belt designation from these sites would mean it is less easy to refuse applications for release of further Green Belt land in future.	None stated.	The proposals set out in the Draft Site Allocations DPD are part of the plan making process, detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework. How this relates to the Borough and this plan is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 1.0. The process of deciding planning applications is a different to the plan making process, and this document does not change the Council's or national policies used in making decisions about Green Belt sites that are not allocated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	There is a fear that removing the Green Belt designation from these sites would mean it is less easy to refuse applications for release of further Green Belt land in future.	None stated.	The proposals set out in the Draft Site Allocations DPD are part of the plan making process, detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework. How this relates to the Borough and this plan is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 1.0. The process of deciding planning applications is a different to the plan making process, and this document does not change the Council's or national policies used in making decisions about Green Belt sites that are not allocated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	There are many brownfield sites in the area that have better potential, for example the Broadwater [~oaks] area in West Byfleet which has roads, a huge area and permission already.	Suggests use of brownfield sites instead, specifically Broadoaks in West Byfleet.	Broadoaks in West Byfleet (assuming this is the correct interpretation of the reference made) is already included as a Site Allocation (Site GB16). However, a much larger quantity of land is needed to meet development requirements across the Borough, as detailed in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Alternative brownfield sites are addressed in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	There are many brownfield sites in the area that have better potential, for example the Broadwater [~oaks] area in West Byfleet which has roads, a huge area and permission already.	Suggests use of brownfield sites instead, specifically Broadoaks in West Byfleet.	Broadoaks in West Byfleet (assuming this is the correct interpretation of the reference made) is already included as a Site Allocation (Site GB16). However, a much larger quantity of land is needed to meet development requirements across the Borough, as detailed in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Alternative brownfield sites are addressed in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	Roads in and around the village are already congested and dangerous, which would be worsened with additional traffic from the proposed developments.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	Roads in and around the village are already congested and dangerous, which would be worsened with additional traffic from the proposed developments.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	The schools in Pyrford are unable to deal with existing demand, and the demand from the proposals would mean either new school space will be build (further compromising the Green Belt?) or children from the village will have to be bussed out to school elsewhere.	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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	The schools in Pyrford are unable to deal with existing demand, and the demand from the proposals would mean either new school space will be build (further compromising the Green Belt?) or children from the village will have to be bussed out to school elsewhere.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	Appreciates the need for new homes, that everyone wants and deserves their own home and that WBC under national government requirements has a duty to provide as much housing as possible. Also brownfield requires more preparation work, affecting potential profit. But surely the answer isn't to dig up this 'green and pleasant land' which we must all be guardians of for future generations.	None stated.	Comment noted, however the justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Consideration of alternative sites, including brownfield land, is included in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	Appreciates the need for new homes, that everyone wants and deserves their own home and that WBC under national government requirements has a duty to provide as much housing as possible. Also brownfield requires more preparation work, affecting potential profit. But surely the answer isn't to dig up this 'green and pleasant land' which we must all be guardians of for future generations.	None stated.	Comment noted, however the justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Consideration of alternative sites, including brownfield land, is included in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	Against the proposals. Since moving to the village in 1974, when it was very rural, there has been a change to the demographic of the village due to several developments.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. 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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	Against the proposals. Since moving to the village in 1974, when it was very rural, there has been a change to the demographic of the village due to several developments.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. 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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	Asks the Council to require developers to explore previously used sites or sites that are derelict/ surplus to requirement, and protect Pyrford from more development. The village cannot be the same with these developments.	Protect these sites from development. Require developers to explore previously uses sites or where there are derelict/ surplus properties.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0, 11.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	Asks the Council to require developers to explore previously used sites or sites that are derelict/ surplus to requirement, and protect Pyrford from more development. The village cannot be the same with these developments.	Protect these sites from development. Require developers to explore previously	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0, 11.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					uses sites or where there are derelict/surplus properties.		
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	The developments [already built] has put strain on the village's infrastructure	None stated.	This representation 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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	The St Martin's Mews development (gated) has fragmented the village, creating an uncomfortable 'us and them' situation. Fears the same fragmenting could occur with the proposed developments.	None stated.	This comment is noted, and new development should be designed to promote cohesive communities and inclusion, rather than fragmentation. The Council will seek to ensure that the same does not occur with these developments, and its approach to design of new development is outlined in Policy CS21 of the Council's Core Strategy, and in its Design Supplementary Planning Guidance. Further detail is included in the draft allocation's key requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	The St Martin's Mews development (gated) has fragmented the village, creating an uncomfortable 'us and them' situation. Fears the same fragmenting could occur with the proposed developments.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. 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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	The St Martin's Mews development (gated) has fragmented the village, creating an uncomfortable 'us and them' situation. Fears the same fragmenting could occur with the proposed developments.	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. 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
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB12	Local infrastructure (roads, schools, drains etc) are already overstretched and will be unable to cope with demand from new residents. This is due to redevelopment of larger houses into multiple houses, which has increased the number of homes and families in the area, and lead to the village now being at capacity.	None stated.	The first part of this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. The second part of the representation is an example of intensification, or infill development, within existing urban areas and local centres. This is generally supported (with regard to other Development Plan policies) by the Council's strategy for housing provision, as outlined in Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1428	Tim, Ros	Morgan	GB13	Local infrastructure (roads, schools, drains etc) are already overstretched and will be unable to cope with demand from new residents. This is due to redevelopment of larger houses into multiple houses, which has increased the number of homes and families in the area, and lead to the village now being at capacity.	None stated.	The first part of this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. The second part of the representation is an example of intensification, or infill development, within existing urban areas and local centres. This is generally supported (with regard to other Development Plan policies) by the Council's strategy for housing provision, as outlined in Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
680	Dave	Morrell	GB12	The local infrastructure (schools, roads, transport) will not be able to cope with the increased population	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
680	Dave	Morrell	GB13	The local infrastructure (schools, roads, transport) will not be able to cope with the increased population	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
680	Dave	Morrell	GB12	Objects to building on Green Belt sites, supports brownfield development	None stated.	The Core Strategy states in Policy CS1 that most of the new development in the Borough will be directed to previously developed land. Nevertheless based on the Council's evidence put forward at the Core Strategy Examination, the existing urban area is only expected to be able to deliver the Borough's housing requirements up to 2022. After this the Green Belt has been identified as a broad location for future growth. This has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
680	Dave	Morrell	GB13	Objects to building on Green Belt sites, supports brownfield development	None stated.	The Core Strategy states in Policy CS1 that most of the new development in the Borough will be directed to previously developed land. Nevertheless based on the Council's evidence put forward at the Core Strategy Examination, the existing urban area is only expected to be able to deliver the Borough's housing requirements up to 2022. After this the Green Belt has been identified as a broad location for future growth. This has been set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
56	Allan	Morris	GB7	<p>Objects to the proposed removal and destruction of the Green Belt land in and around Mayford. Moved to Mayford because village's rural setting.</p> <p>Strongly objects to the proposed increase of Traveller Pitches as there are already 3 sites, all concentrated in one side of the Borough. Further expansion is unnecessary and unjustifiable, as Woking already generously provides for the Traveller community. Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because it reduces the openness of the Green Belt.</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
56	Allan	Morris	GB8	Understand the need for a school in Woking, however this site isn't necessarily right because Egley Road is the main feed road between Woking and Guildford. The road carries a lot of traffic, both light and heavy goods vehicles traffic and a school would increase traffic volume endangering pedestrians. Land attached to The Mayford Centre has a school already on site and is therefore proposed as a more suitable site. Concerned that football pitches and leisure facilities will extend the school day into evenings and weekends, even with leisure and sports facilities less than two miles away.	A more suitable site for a school would be land attached to The Mayford Centre.	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The school and the leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
56	Allan	Morris	GB8	Strongly object as residents of Egley Road will have extreme difficulty accessing their properties due to increased traffic, from both the school and the construction traffic. At certain times of the day it can take up to 10 minutes to exit properties. The development will remove the green space between Mayford and Woking, making Mayford a suburb of Woking, losing its rural village status and becoming part of an urban township.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network. The evidence set out in detail in Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper demonstrates that the distinctiveness of Mayford 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
						not be significantly undermined by the proposals. Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	
56	Allan	Morris	GB10	<p>The removal of green space on this site for housing will make Mayford a suburb of Woking. Saunders Lane is a narrow road, almost single track in places and unsuitable for the amount of increased traffic created by the proposed development. Roads adjacent to Saunders Lane are 'B' class with single track, weight restricted bridges over the railway. The road infrastructure will not cope with the traffic from 800 new properties.</p> <p>When Vicarage Road in Westfield was closed recently the increased traffic flow on Egley Road and surrounding area caused long delays in getting into Woking - an indication of the future traffic problems.</p>	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
56	Allan	Morris	GB10	Strong objection to all proposed developments, which give no consideration for existing residents and the Green Belt, which can not be reinstated once built on. The Council doesn't appears to be following Central Government guidance (October, 2014) to protect the Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
56	Allan	Morris	GB11	<p>The removal of green space on this site for housing will make Mayford a suburb of Woking. Saunders Lane is a narrow road, almost single track in places and unsuitable for the amount of increased traffic created by the proposed development. Roads adjacent to Saunders Lane are 'B' class with single track, weight restricted bridges over the railway. The road infrastructure will not cope with the traffic from 800 new properties.</p> <p>When Vicarage Road in Westfield was closed recently the increased traffic flow on Egley Road and surrounding area caused long delays in getting into Woking - an indication of the future traffic problems.</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
56	Allan	Morris	GB11	Strong objection to all proposed developments, which give no consideration for existing residents and the Green Belt, which can not be reinstated once built on. The Council doesn't appears to be following Central Government guidance (October, 2014) to protect the Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	Sets out the five purposes on the Green Belt from national policy. The key objective is to maintain or improve the degree of openness in the landscape, which these developments would significantly damage. States that the sites are not derelict or brownfield but agricultural, open rural	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development within the plan period, and for safeguarding it to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				areas. There are no demonstrable 'special or exceptional circumstances' that justify the removal of sites from the Green Belt. There are very special reasons which dictate the ongoing status and protection of the sites within the Green Belt. The proposed development goes against and blatantly disregards the five purposes of the Green Belt, and would cause unacceptable damage to Ripley and other similar countryside areas in both Woking and Guildford.			
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	Sets out the five purposes on the Green Belt from national policy. The key objective is to maintain or improve the degree of openness in the landscape, which these developments would significantly damage. States that the sites are not derelict or brownfield but agricultural, open rural areas. There are no demonstrable 'special or exceptional circumstances' that justify the removal of sites from the Green Belt. There are very special reasons which dictate the ongoing status and protection of the sites within the Green Belt. The proposed development goes against and blatantly disregards the five purposes of the Green Belt, and would cause unacceptable damage to Ripley and other similar countryside areas in both Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development within the plan period, and for safeguarding it to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	There is currently inadequate secondary school places, with children going to Sheerwater or as far away as Addlestone.	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
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	There is currently inadequate secondary school places, with children going to Sheerwater or as far away as Addlestone.	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
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	No sliproad infrastructure is planned at either Ockham or Burnt Common. This means traffic heading from the site to Guildford or London will have to come through Ripley, where road infrastructure is already overstretched and traffic flow at full capacity, particularly at peak times. Ripley needs to be by-passed before a project of this scale is considered.	Ripley needs to be by-passed before a project of this scale is considered.	This representation 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
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	No sliproad infrastructure is planned at either Ockham or Burnt Common. This means traffic heading from the site to Guildford or London will have to come through Ripley, where road infrastructure is already overstretched and traffic flow at full capacity, particularly at peak times. Ripley needs to be by-passed before a project of this scale is considered.	Ripley needs to be by-passed before a project of this scale is considered.	This representation 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
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	Severe flooding took place last year on Newark Lane, Ripley High St and at the junction of Ockham Road North and the A3 roundabout. Further large development would increase flooding exponentially. In an era of unpredictable climate change, with inadequate flood mitigation, the approach is at worst 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
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	There are few local pedestrian routes meaning there will be no option for residents of development but to use a private vehicle.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pedestrian routes to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that in any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	There are few local pedestrian routes meaning there will be no option for residents of development but to use a private vehicle.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of pedestrian routes to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that in any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	Traffic during development and construction of this scale will adversely effect local roads, which are entirely unsuitable,	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Within this, requirements will be set for development to ensure appropriate servicing and goo delivery to sites during construction phases.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	Traffic during development and construction of this scale will adversely effect local roads, which are entirely unsuitable,	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Within this, requirements will be set for development to ensure appropriate servicing and goo delivery to sites during construction	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
						phases.	of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	In conclusion Ripley Parish Council believes the community is threatened by the proposed development and the lack of proposed infrastructure which will cause huge traffic problems.	None stated.	This representation 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
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	In conclusion Ripley Parish Council believes the community is threatened by the proposed development and the lack of proposed infrastructure which will cause huge traffic problems.	None stated.	This representation 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
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	Ripley is a pleasant and well defined village surrounded by Green Belt land, and villagers are justifiably proud of the Conservation Area status along and around Ripley High Street. Guildford BC defines a Conservation Area as "An area designated as being of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, designated by the local planning authority under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas act 1990".	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	Ripley is a pleasant and well defined village surrounded by Green Belt land, and villagers are justifiably proud of the Conservation Area status along and around Ripley High Street. Guildford BC defines a Conservation Area as "An area designated as being of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, designated by the local planning authority under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas act 1990".	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	Against any interference with the Metropolitan Green Belt, developed to provide a 'green lung' for the urban sprawl of London, and keep a place of relaxation for all. Surrounding areas are clearly defined Green Belt, designed to meet these aims, and once despoiled, could never be recovered. It is our duty to protect and enhance such features.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	Against any interference with the Metropolitan Green Belt, developed to provide a 'green lung' for the urban sprawl of London, and keep a place of relaxation for all. Surrounding areas are clearly defined Green Belt, designed to meet these aims, and once despoiled, could never be recovered. It is our duty to protect and enhance such features.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	Severe flooding took place last year on Newark Lane, Ripley High St and at the junction of Ockham Road North and the A3 roundabout. Further large development would increase flooding exponentially. In an era of unpredictable climate change, with inadequate flood mitigation, the approach is at worst dangerous.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.  In addition, the Council has robust policy and guidance in place to make sure development is of the highest environmental standards. This includes Core Strategy Policy CS22 and the Climate Change SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	The Leader of Guildford Borough Council outlines the need to protect beautiful villages as much as possible, that congestion has been an unwanted product of progress, and that there is a need to be sufficiently restrictive so as not to radically change or damage our environment. This does not sit well alongside the proposed development, which will add to existing congestion. Questions whether Guildford and London bound traffic will pass through Ripley, and states that this will not 'put right' existing congestion nor 'preserve and enhance' the conservation area. The environment will be 'radically changed and damaged'.	None stated.	This representation 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 19.0, 23.0 and 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	The Leader of Guildford Borough Council outlines the need to protect beautiful villages as much as possible, that congestion has been an unwanted product of progress, and that there is a need to be sufficiently restrictive so as not to	None stated.	This representation 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 19.0, 23.0 and 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				radically change or damage our environment. This does not sit well alongside the proposed development, which will add to existing congestion. Questions whether Guildford and London bound traffic will pass through Ripley, and states that this will not 'put right' existing congestion nor 'preserve and enhance' the conservation area. The environment will be 'radically changed and damaged'.			
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	The proposed development is completely out of scale with the proportion of both Pyrford and Ripley, and other settlements nearby.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. As stated in the paper, less development on the site than set out in the DPD could require the Council to identify more land in the Green Belt to meet housing needs.</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
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	The proposed development is completely out of scale with the proportion of both Pyrford and Ripley, and other settlements nearby.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. As stated in the paper, less development on the site than set out in the DPD could require the Council to identify more land in the Green Belt to meet housing needs.</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
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	There is no proven need to sacrifice Green Belt land, and in line with the NPPF, no case for pursuing the development of these sites.	None stated.	The Council believes that its approach is consistent with the NPPF. In addition the need to release Green Belt land for development needs has already been established during the preparation and examination of the Core Strategy. This is clearly set out 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
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	There is no proven need to sacrifice Green Belt land, and in line with the NPPF, no case for pursuing the development of these sites.	None stated.	The Council believes that its approach is consistent with the NPPF. In addition the need to release Green Belt land for development needs has already been established during the preparation and examination of the Core Strategy. This is clearly set out 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
511	Jim	Morris	GB12	This is not a standalone development. Other development earmarked in the locality eg Burnt Common or the former Wisley airfield will add even more 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, and Section 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
511	Jim	Morris	GB13	This is not a standalone development. Other development earmarked in the locality eg Burnt Common or the former Wisley airfield will add even more 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, and Section 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB9	Will change the village into a suburb of Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB10	Will change the village into a suburb of Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB11	Will change the village into a suburb of Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						It is 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.	of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB8	Object to a school on this site. Traffic is already busy, additional development will make it worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.  Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB9	Objects to housing development on all sites. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support for this amount of housing. The road network is poor, there are few pavements and limited public transport.	None stated.	This representation 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
866	Nicki	Morris	GB10	Objects to housing development on all sites. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support for this amount of housing. The road network is poor, there are few pavements and limited public transport.	None stated.	This representation 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
866	Nicki	Morris	GB11	Objects to housing development on all sites. Mayford does not have the infrastructure to support for this amount of housing. The road network is poor, there are few pavements and limited public transport.	None stated.	This representation 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
866	Nicki	Morris	GB8	Enjoys the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB9	Enjoys the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB10	Enjoys the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB11	Enjoys the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB14	Enjoys the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.  It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB7	Enjoys the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.  In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6:	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
866	Nicki	Morris	GB9	Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
866	Nicki	Morris	GB10	Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
866	Nicki	Morris	GB11	Please refer to the response from the Mayford Village Society who I am happy 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
866	Nicki	Morris	GB7	Objects to increasing the number of pitches on the site. There are already 3 sites in the Borough there is no justification to provide more. This is Green Belt.	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
866	Nicki	Morris	GB8	Additional leisure and sports facilities are not needed due to the proximity of Woking Leisure Centre and Woking Football Club. These facilities will lead to more weekend and evening noise and light pollution. Appreciate the need for a school.	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the scheme will not generate a significant amount of noise or light pollution that will be to the detriment of local residents or the general environment. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.  Nevertheless the Council has robust policies in place that mitigate the impact of noise and light pollution on the environment and general amenity.  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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
866	Nicki	Morris	GB8	Mayford Centre should be considered, there is already a school on site, it is off the main road and there is land to build on. This site is Green Belt.	What is wrong with the Mayford Centre, there is already a school on site, it is off the main road and plenty of land to build on.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1372	Neill	Morrison	GB12	Appalled that WBC are considering the release of GB land particularly against recommendations of the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1372	Neill	Morrison	GB13	Appalled that WBC are considering the release of GB land particularly against recommendations of the GBBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1372	Neill	Morrison	GB12	There is currently a clear established boundary within Pyrford. The proposals would be out of keeping with the current environment.	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
1372	Neill	Morrison	GB13	There is currently a clear established boundary within Pyrford. The proposals would be out of keeping with the current environment.	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>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	
1372	Neill	Morrison	GB12	<p>The proposals would have a detrimental impact on historic views.</p> <p>Pyrford does not have sufficient infrastructure to support the proposed growth- including schools and the existing strained road network.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 19.0, 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> <p>With regards to the representation on infrastructure, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. Please also see Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1372	Neill	Morrison	GB13	<p>The proposals would have a detrimental impact on historic views.</p> <p>Pyrford does not have sufficient infrastructure to support the proposed growth- including schools and the existing strained road network.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 19.0, 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> <p>With regards to the representation on infrastructure, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. Please also see Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB13	400 houses would cause a traffic nightmare, instead of the comfortable drive enjoyed presently	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB12	400 houses would cause a traffic nightmare, instead of the comfortable drive enjoyed presently	None stated	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB13	Its vital that people have easy access to the rural environment here, as a retreat from the urban environment	None stated	<p>The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the</p>	No further modification is 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 character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB12	Its vital that people have easy access to the rural environment here, as a retreat from the urban environment	None stated	The Council is satisfied that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23 and 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB12	The rep raises legal and technical issues with proposals and reference comments from Pyrford Forum	None stated	The Council has made sure that the DPD is being prepared in accordance with the relevant legal and procedural requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB13	The rep raises legal and technical issues with proposals and reference comments from Pyrford Forum	None stated	The Council is satisfied that the DPD is being prepared in accordance with the relevant legal and procedural requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB12	Stunned by the proposals for Green Belt near Pyrford.  As a local resident, they are aware of the local infrastructure, and currently schools, doctors and elderly care facilities are at capacity. The area cannot cope with new proposals development.	None stated	The infrastructure requirements to support the allocations 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
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB13	Stunned by the proposals for Green Belt near Pyrford.  As a local resident, they are aware of the local infrastructure, and currently schools, doctors and elderly care facilities are at capacity. The area cannot cope with new proposals development.	None stated	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach 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
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB13	Reconsider areas that are valued for their natural beauty and ease of access. Don't destroy these beautiful spots	None stated	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
153	Campbell	Morrow	GB12	Reconsider areas that are valued for their natural beauty and ease of access. Don't destroy these beautiful spots	None stated	The Council is satisfied that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23 and 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
141	P Carol	Morton	GB12	How can we trust our local Council who now plan to build on land which produces food and is Green Belt?	None stated.	The proposals will avoid the use of the most versatile agricultural land in the area. The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
141	P Carol	Morton	GB12	There is a heavy amount of traffic passing through this area every day; no more can be added.	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
141	P Carol	Morton	GB12	The pollution levels would rise and what is presently a pleasant area to live would become over populated.	None stated.	The Council has robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to control as a result of any development that will come forward. These are site specific requirements that will be comprehensively addressed as part of the development management process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
141	P Carol	Morton	GB12	West Byfleet shopping has just sufficient parking.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
141	P Carol	Morton	GB12	I struggle to keep my garden for wildlife, which is essential for the lives of all of us. When wild life stops – humans also cannot survive.	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
141	P Carol	Morton	GB13	How can we trust our local Council who now plan to build on land which produces food and is Green Belt?	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The Council has been careful to ensure that the proposed allocations would not undermine the most versatile agricultural land in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
141	P Carol	Morton	GB13	There is a heavy amount of traffic passing through this area every day; no more can be added.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
141	P Carol	Morton	GB13	The pollution levels would rise and what is presently a pleasant area to live would become over populated.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not generate unacceptable pollution levels that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
141	P Carol	Morton	GB13	West Byfleet shopping has just sufficient parking.	None stated.	Any development will be required to meet the adopted car and cycle parking standards for the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
141	P Carol	Morton	GB13	I struggle to keep my garden for wildlife, which is essential for the lives of all of us. When wild life stops – humans also cannot survive.	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	No further modification is 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.	
528	Morgan	Morton	GB12	Strongly objects to the proposals for housing. Values the views from the outskirts of Pyrford towards Ripley, and does not want to lose the sense of living in the beautiful Surrey countryside.	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, in particular protecting important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
528	Morgan	Morton	GB13	Strongly objects to the proposals for housing. Values the views from the outskirts of Pyrford towards Ripley, and does not want to lose the sense of living in the beautiful Surrey countryside.	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, in particular protecting important views.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
528	Morgan	Morton	GB12	Concerned about increasing traffic and the effect on safety on local roads. States there are inadequate speed restrictions, signage and road markings for filter lanes, and fairly frequent accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
528	Morgan	Morton	GB13	Concerned about increasing traffic and the effect on safety on local roads. States there are inadequate speed restrictions, signage and road markings for filter lanes, and fairly frequent accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA28	Going in and out of the estate is already dangerous and a nightmare at school times. The number of buses is going to be reduced, increasing traffic movements. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (the shop area, garages behind the shop and near Barnsbury school). This could improve the appearance of the estate and the security/quality of life of residents but without over crowding the area. The backlands should be left as they are. Where unused they could be transformed into allotments to increase communication between residents and community feeling.	1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area! 2. The backlands	Comments about the need to improve the estate will be pass onto the relevant officers of the Council. The proposed allocations in Barnsbury will also contribute towards improving the area. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is 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 be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA29	Going in and out of the estate is already dangerous and a nightmare at school times. The number of buses is going to be reduced, increasing traffic movements.	<p>1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!</p> <p>2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into</p>	<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 Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA28	Local primary and new secondary schools are already fully subscribed. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new school provision. This development will have the same issue.	<p>1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!</p> <p>2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community</p>	The general approach to infrastructure provision including educational facilities is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					feeling.		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA29	Local primary and new secondary schools are already fully subscribed. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new school provision. This development will have the same issue.	1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area! 2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.	The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Site Allocations DPD makes provision for the delivery of a secondary school. Since the publication of the draft DPD for Regulation 19 consultation, planning permission has been granted for the school proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA28	It is already difficult to have doctors appointments. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new provision for surgeries. This development will have the same issue.	1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
					<p>rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!</p> <p>2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.</p>		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA29	It is already difficult to have doctors appointments. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new provision for surgeries. This development will have the same issue.	1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
					<p>Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!</p> <p>2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.</p>		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA28	Increasing antisocial behaviour in the area; increasing the population and reducing children's play area will not improve quality of life.	<p>1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats).</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will lead to anti social behaviours in the area. It is expected that any development of the site will be supported by adequate open space and children play areas. Overall, it is envisaged that the proposal will enhance the general environment of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					<p>This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!</p> <p>2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.</p>		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA29	Increasing antisocial behaviour in the area; increasing the population and reducing children's play area will not improve quality of life.	<p>1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will lead to anti social behaviours in the area. It is expected that any development of the site will be supported by adequate open space and children play areas. Overall, it is envisaged that the proposal will enhance the general environment of the area.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					without over crowding the area! 2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA28	Backlands have wildlife and should be preserved.	1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area! 2. The backlands should be left as they are. When	The Council will ensure that any backland development meets all relevant policies of the Development Plan including the need to protect wildlife. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
					unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the communication between residents and community feeling.		
1193	Dominique	Mouliere-Reiser	UA29	Backlands have wildlife and should be preserved.	<p>1. Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!</p> <p>2. The backlands should be left as they are. When unused, may be they could be transformed into allotments in order to increase the</p>	<p>The Council will ensure that any backland development meets all relevant policies of the Development Plan including the need to protect wildlife. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
					communication between residents and community feeling.		
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB8	Mayford is a historic village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Site GB8 is in an AHAP. The development should be in line with the character of the village. The proposed densities are much higher than surrounding densities.	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
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB9	Mayford is a historic village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Site GB8 is in an AHAP. The development should be in line with the character of the village. The proposed densities are much higher than surrounding densities.	None stated.	<p>Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In fact the key requirements of GB8 notes the AHAP and requires an archaeological investigation.</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 refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and 18.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB10	Mayford is a historic village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Site GB8 is in an AHAP. The development should be in line with the character of the village. The proposed densities are much higher than surrounding densities.	None stated.	<p>Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In fact the key requirements of GB8 notes the AHAP and requires an archaeological investigation.</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 refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and 18.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB11	Mayford is a historic village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Site GB8 is in an AHAP. The development should be in line with the character of the village. The proposed densities are much higher than surrounding densities.	None stated.	<p>Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In fact the key requirements of GB8 notes the AHAP and requires an archaeological investigation.</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 refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and 18.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB14	Mayford is a historic village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Site GB8 is in an AHAP. The development should be in line with the character of the village. The proposed densities are much higher than surrounding densities.	None stated.	<p>Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In fact the key requirements of GB8 notes the AHAP and requires an archaeological investigation.</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 refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and 18.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB7	The Core Strategy has a stated need for 19 pitches, but the SA DPD identifies 22. This does not include travelling show-people pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB7	Object to increasing number of pitches on the site. The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI, additional pitches would increase the risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals, development, pollution and traffic.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>for 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>	
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB8	GB9 has to provide the amenities which are lacking in GB8. This will encourage further growth in the area and does not prevent sprawl.	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 Green Belt boundary review recommends a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary that has been considered by the Council to be suitable in protecting the Green Belt far beyond the Plan period. Therefore the development proposals around Mayford will not result in additional development in this area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB9	GB9 has to provide the amenities which are lacking in GB8. This will encourage further growth in the area and does not prevent sprawl.	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 Green Belt boundary review recommends a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary that has been considered by the Council to be suitable in protecting the Green Belt far beyond the Plan period. Therefore the development proposals around Mayford will not result in additional development in this area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB10	GB9 has to provide the amenities which are lacking in GB8. This will encourage further growth in the area and does not prevent sprawl.	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 Green Belt boundary review recommends a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary that has been considered by the Council to be suitable in protecting the Green Belt far beyond the Plan period. Therefore the development proposals around Mayford will not result in additional development in this area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB11	GB9 has to provide the amenities which are lacking in GB8. This will encourage further growth in the area and does not	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				prevent sprawl.		<p>and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review recommends a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary that has been considered by the Council to be suitable in protecting the Green Belt far beyond the Plan period. Therefore the development proposals around Mayford will not result in additional development in this area.</p>	of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB14	GB9 has to provide the amenities which are lacking in GB8. This will encourage further growth in the area and does not prevent sprawl.	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 Green Belt boundary review recommends a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary that has been considered by the Council to be suitable in protecting the Green Belt far beyond the Plan period. Therefore the development proposals around Mayford will not result in additional development in this area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB8	The GBBR states the current Green Belt boundary is well defined and maintains the separation between Woking and Guildford. These sites preserve the green gap between Woking and Mayford. The provision of screening is a poor compromise.	None stated.	<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
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB9	The GBBR states the current Green Belt boundary is well defined and maintains the separation between Woking and Guildford. These sites preserve the green gap between Woking and Mayford. The provision of screening is a poor compromise.	None stated.	<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
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB10	The GBBR states the current Green Belt boundary is well defined and maintains the separation between Woking and Guildford. These sites preserve the green gap between Woking and Mayford. The provision of screening is a poor compromise.	None stated.	<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
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB11	The GBBR states the current Green Belt boundary is well defined and maintains the separation between Woking and Guildford. These sites preserve the green gap between Woking and Mayford. The provision of screening is a poor compromise.	None stated.	<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
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB14	The GBBR states the current Green Belt boundary is well defined and maintains the separation between Woking and Guildford. These sites preserve the green gap between Woking and Mayford. The provision of screening is a poor compromise.	None stated.	<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
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB8	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Access to Mayford is restricted by 2 single road bridges and local roads	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				are lanes.		<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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p> <p>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>	
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB9	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Access to Mayford is restricted by 2 single road bridges and local roads are lanes.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p> <p>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>	
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB10	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Access to Mayford is restricted by 2 single road bridges and local roads are lanes.	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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p> <p>The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB11	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Access to Mayford is restricted by 2 single road bridges and local roads are lanes.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p> <p>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>	
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB14	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Access to Mayford is restricted by 2 single road bridges and local roads are lanes.	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 should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p> <p>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>	
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB8	Green Belt land should only be released in exceptional circumstances. The Council has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Despite this the SA DPD goes beyond the Core Strategy 550 requirement and allocates a further 1200 homes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB9	Green Belt land should only be released in exceptional circumstances. The Council has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Despite this the SA DPD goes beyond the Core Strategy 550 requirement and allocates a further 1200 homes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB10	Green Belt land should only be released in exceptional circumstances. The Council has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Despite this the SA DPD goes beyond the Core Strategy 550 requirement and allocates a further 1200 homes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB11	Green Belt land should only be released in exceptional circumstances. The Council has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Despite this the SA DPD goes beyond the Core Strategy 550 requirement and allocates a further 1200 homes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB14	Green Belt land should only be released in exceptional circumstances. The Council has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. Despite this the SA DPD goes beyond the Core Strategy 550 requirement and allocates a further 1200 homes.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB8	Removing the site from the Green Belt goes against the principle of safeguarding the countryside.	None stated.	Whilst the Green Belt boundary review notes the importance of the site to prevent encroachment into the countryside, the Council has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB9	Removing the site from the Green Belt goes against the principle of safeguarding the countryside.	None stated.	Whilst the Green Belt boundary review notes the importance of the site to prevent encroachment into the countryside, the Council has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB10	Removing the site from the Green Belt goes against the principle of safeguarding the countryside.	None stated.	Whilst the Green Belt boundary review notes the importance of the site to prevent encroachment into the countryside, the Council has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB11	Removing the site from the Green Belt goes against the principle of safeguarding the countryside.	None stated.	Whilst the Green Belt boundary review notes the importance of the site to prevent encroachment into the countryside, the Council has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB14	Removing the site from the Green Belt goes against the principle of safeguarding the countryside.	None stated.	Whilst the Green Belt boundary review notes the importance of the site to prevent encroachment into the countryside, the Council has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB8	Vulnerable, older people and people in social and affordable houses will be let down as the sites are not well served by local amenities or public transport links. The GBBR estimated travel times from Google, which did not account for traffic delays.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>measures 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>In addition, Core Strategy Policy support the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups where suitable.</p>	
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB9	Vulnerable, older people and people in social and affordable houses will be let down as the sites are not well served by local amenities or public transport links. The GBBR estimated travel times from Google, which did not account for traffic delays.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0,11.0,16.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>In addition, Core Strategy Policy support the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups where suitable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB10	Vulnerable, older people and people in social and affordable houses will be let down as the sites are not well served by local amenities or public transport links. The GBBR estimated travel times from Google, which did not account for traffic delays.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0,11.0,16.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>In addition, Core Strategy Policy support the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups where suitable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB11	Vulnerable, older people and people in social and affordable houses will be let down as the sites are not well served by local amenities or public transport links. The GBBR estimated travel times from Google, which did not account for traffic delays.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0,11.0,16.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>In addition, Core Strategy Policy support the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups where suitable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1036	Serguei	Mouratove	GB14	Vulnerable, older people and people in social and affordable houses will be let down as the sites are not well served by local amenities or public transport links. The GBBR estimated travel times from Google, which did not account for traffic delays.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 10.0,11.0,16.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>In addition, Core Strategy Policy support the development of specialist accommodation for older people and vulnerable groups where suitable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
139	BJ	Muir	General	The plans to build on the Green Belt are not viable and there is no need for it. The traffic problem will be immense and no traffic survey has been done by Woking Borough Council.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section . 1, 2 and 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
139	BJ	Muir	General	Have alternative Brown Field Sites be identified and considered? We request this application is refused.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The justification for the use of Green Belt land to meet future	No further modification is proposed as a result



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development needs is addressed in Section 1 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	The building on GB destroys the ethos of the GB	None stated.	The five main purposes Green Belt is set out under paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt but as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, an exceptional circumstances case has been established and it is necessary for the release of Green Belt land to address the significant unmet need.  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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	The building on GB destroys the ethos of the GB	None stated.	The five main purposes Green Belt is set out under paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt but as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, an exceptional circumstances case has been established and it is necessary for the release of Green Belt land to address the significant unmet need.  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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	The building on GB destroys the ethos of the GB	None stated.	The five main purposes Green Belt is set out under paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt but as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, an exceptional circumstances case has been established and it is necessary for the release of Green Belt land to address the significant unmet need.  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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	The building on GB destroys the ethos of the GB	None stated.	The five main purposes Green Belt is set out under paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The Council attaches great importance to the Green Belt but as explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, an exceptional circumstances case has been established and it is necessary for the release of Green Belt land to address the significant unmet need.  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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	Suggests that some golf courses in the areas could be redeveloped for housing with minimal impact on the local population	None stated.	Many of the Borough's golf courses in the Borough were considered as part of parcels considered in the Green Belt Boundary Review and were considered to have low suitability for removal for various reasons.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	Suggests that some golf courses in the areas could be redeveloped for housing with minimal impact on the local population	None stated.	Many of the Borough's golf courses in the Borough were considered as part of parcels considered in the Green Belt Boundary Review and were considered to have low suitability for removal for various reasons.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	Suggests that some golf courses in the areas could be redeveloped for housing with minimal impact on the local population	None stated.	Many of the Borough's golf courses in the Borough were considered as part of parcels considered in the Green Belt Boundary Review and were considered to have low suitability for removal for various reasons.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	Suggests that some golf courses in the areas could be redeveloped for housing with minimal impact on the local population	None stated.	Many of the Borough's golf courses in the Borough were considered as part of parcels considered in the Green Belt Boundary Review and were considered to have low suitability for removal for various reasons.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	Unfortunate that developers get involved in planning decisions, where their interest are motivated by achieving maximum profit	None stated.	It is important to note that the sustainable growth of the borough requires investment from private developers, the Council can not deliver the growth to meet future needs without contribution from the private sector. However, the Council is confident that there are robust Development Plan policies and guidance to make sure that any proposal for the development are sensitive to its surroundings and to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	Unfortunate that developers get involved in planning decisions, where their interest are motivated by achieving maximum profit	None stated.	It is important to note that the sustainable growth of the borough requires investment from private developers, the Council can not deliver the growth to meet future needs without contribution from the private sector. However, the Council is confident that there are robust Development Plan policies and guidance to make sure that any proposal for the development are sensitive to its surroundings and to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	Unfortunate that developers get involved in planning decisions, where their interest are motivated by achieving maximum profit	None stated.	It is important to note that the sustainable growth of the borough requires investment from private developers, the Council can not deliver the growth to meet future needs without contribution from the private sector. However, the Council is confident that there are robust Development Plan policies and guidance to make sure that any proposal for the development are sensitive to its surroundings and to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	Unfortunate that developers get involved in planning decisions, where their interest are motivated by achieving maximum profit	None stated.	It is important to note that the sustainable growth of the borough requires investment from private developers, the Council can not deliver the growth to meet future needs without contribution from the private sector. However, the Council is confident that there are robust Development Plan policies and guidance to make sure that any proposal for the development are sensitive to its surroundings and to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local	No further modification is 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. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	Proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet will destroy the natural environment and wildlife; and contribute to urban sprawl	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a detailed ecological survey is required 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	Proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet will destroy the natural environment and wildlife; and contribute to urban sprawl	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a detailed ecological survey is required 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	Proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet will destroy the natural environment and wildlife; and contribute to urban sprawl	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a detailed ecological survey is required 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	Proposals for Byfleet and West Byfleet will destroy the natural environment and wildlife; and contribute to urban sprawl	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a detailed ecological survey is required 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	Proposals for the area are not proportional, development is being focused in the Byfleet area and the rest Woking will be untouched. This appears unfair and undemocratic ?	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the	No further modification is 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. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the approach taken to identify sites is fair. The methodology is clear and transparent, and based on a variety of technical evidence base. The Council has to meet legal procedures in preparing the DPD, including requirements for public consultation. The Council has published the Site Allocation DPD for public consultation and is seeking comments on the contents. The document will be modified according to the comments received at this stage, where there will also be another opportunity for comments to be made at Regulation 19 Consultation.</p>	
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	Proposals for the area are not proportional, development is being focused in the Byfleet area and the rest Woking will be untouched. This appears unfair and undemocratic ?	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>The Council is confident that the approach taken to identify sites is fair. The methodology is clear and transparent, and based on a variety of technical evidence base. The Council has to meet legal procedures in preparing the DPD, including requirements for public consultation. The Council has published the Site Allocation DPD for public consultation and is seeking comments on the contents. The document will be modified according to the comments received at this stage, where there will also be another opportunity for comments to be made at Regulation 19 Consultation.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	Proposals for the area are not proportional, development is being focused in the Byfleet area and the rest Woking will be untouched. This appears unfair and undemocratic ?	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>The Council is confident that the approach taken to identify sites is fair. The methodology is clear and transparent, and based on a variety of technical evidence base. The Council has to meet legal procedures in preparing the DPD, including requirements for public consultation.</p>	No further modification is 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 published the Site Allocation DPD for public consultation and is seeking comments on the contents. The document will be modified according to the comments received at this stage, where there will also be another opportunity for comments to be made at Regulation 19 Consultation.	
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	Proposals for the area are not proportional, development is being focused in the Byfleet area and the rest Woking will be untouched. This appears unfair and undemocratic ?	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>The Council is confident that the approach taken to identify sites is fair. The methodology is clear and transparent, and based on a variety of technical evidence base. The Council has to meet legal procedures in preparing the DPD, including requirements for public consultation. The Council has published the Site Allocation DPD for public consultation and is seeking comments on the contents. The document will be modified according to the comments received at this stage, where there will also be another opportunity for comments to be made at Regulation 19 Consultation.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	The proposals would create additional vehicles and exacerbate traffic problems 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 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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	The proposals would create additional vehicles and exacerbate traffic problems 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</p>	No further modification is 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 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>	
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	The proposals would create additional vehicles and exacerbate traffic problems 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 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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	The proposals would create additional vehicles and exacerbate traffic problems 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 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</p>	No further modification is 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 Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	Local infrastructure/utilities already struggles. Mains water, drainage and electricity have not been mentioned	None stated.	The provision of utilities services are through private companies. The companies for the Woking Borough area are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan IDP. Overall, infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, particularly 3.9-3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	Local infrastructure/utilities already struggles. Mains water, drainage and electricity have not been mentioned	None stated.	The provision of utilities services are through private companies. The companies for the Woking Borough area are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan IDP. Overall, infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, particularly 3.9-3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	Local infrastructure/utilities already struggles. Mains water, drainage and electricity have not been mentioned	None stated.	The provision of utilities services are through private companies. The companies for the Woking Borough area are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan IDP. Overall, infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, particularly 3.9-3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	Local infrastructure/utilities already struggles. Mains water, drainage and electricity have not been mentioned	None stated.	The provision of utilities services are through private companies. The companies for the Woking Borough area are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan IDP. Overall, infrastructure has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, particularly 3.9-3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
390	Brian	Mullin	GB4	Flooding to the SW of the area is a frequent occurrence, concreting over green areas will exacerbate this	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in 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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB5	Flooding to the SW of the area is a frequent occurrence, concreting over green areas will exacerbate this	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in 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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB15	Flooding to the SW of the area is a frequent occurrence, concreting over green areas will exacerbate this	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in 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
390	Brian	Mullin	GB16	Flooding to the SW of the area is a frequent occurrence, concreting over green areas will exacerbate this	None stated.	Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in 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
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB12	The surrounding country roads are currently under strain. The proposals would give rise to approximately 800 more cars on local 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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB13	The surrounding country roads are currently under strain. The proposals would give rise to approximately 800 more cars on local 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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB12	The local school is about to be rebuilt to meet existing needs. How can the additional need from the proposals be met?	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
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB13	The local school is about to be rebuilt to meet existing needs. How can the additional need from the proposals be met?	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
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB12	In addition to ignoring advice from consultants, WBC is refusing to meet representatives from the village to discuss their objections. This is against the ethos of consultation with the local community.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and Section 17.0  In general, the Council agreed to most requests to attend local meetings to discuss matters with local representatives and it is satisfied that that it has undertaken a sufficient level of consultation within the available resources.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB13	In addition to ignoring advice from consultants, WBC is refusing to meet representatives from the village to discuss their objections. This is against the ethos of consultation with the local community.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and Section 17.0  In general, the Council agreed to most requests to attend local meetings to discuss matters with local representatives and it is satisfied that that it has undertaken a sufficient level of consultation within the available resources.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB12	Object to proposals in Pyrford. The proposals are at od with Governments five stated purposes of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB13	Object to proposals in Pyrford. The proposals are at od with Governments five stated purposes of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB12	The sites are located on productive arable land that are irreplaceable.	None stated.	The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
369	Michael	Mulvany	GB13	The sites are located on productive arable land that are irreplaceable.	None stated.	The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
597	Robert	Munford	GB12	The village is attractive due to its pleasant environment, character and safety, and its wide blend of facilities. Once destroyed this can not readily be re-created.	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, including its sense of place and distinctive characteristics. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected. Overall, the Council believes that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
597	Robert	Munford	GB13	The village is attractive due to its pleasant environment, character and safety, and its wide blend of facilities. Once destroyed this can not readily be re-created. Must concede some change and development must [unfinished text]	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, including its sense of place and distinctive characteristics.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected. Overall, the Council believes that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary	
597	Robert	Munford	GB12	Objects as the village is already congested with traffic and this will be worsened with more people.	None stated.	This representation 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
597	Robert	Munford	GB13	Objects as the village is already congested with traffic and this will be worsened with more people.	None stated.	This representation 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
597	Robert	Munford	GB12	There is insufficient local infrastructure, particularly schools (Pyrford Primary School is being re-built to meet current demand), elderly care facilities, and nursery and pre-school facilities, which are currently at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of primary school capacity in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. The Council's approach to elderly care (specialist accommodation for older people and for wider care facilities for the elderly) and also to nurseries and pre-schools is covered in the Core Strategy CS13 and CS19. In addition to this, the draft Site Allocations DPD includes sites allocated for specialist residential accommodation and for community uses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
597	Robert	Munford	GB13	There is insufficient local infrastructure, particularly schools (Pyrford Primary School is being re-built to meet current demand), elderly care facilities, and nursery and pre-school facilities, which are currently at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of primary school capacity in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. The Council's approach to elderly care (specialist accommodation for older people and for wider care facilities for the elderly) and also to nurseries and pre-schools is covered in the Core Strategy CS13 and CS19. In addition to this, the draft Site Allocations DPD includes sites allocated for specialist residential accommodation and for community uses.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
727	H	Murch	General	Thank you for consulting Surrey Heath Borough Council on the Woking Site Allocations Document. Surrey Heath have no formal comments to make at this stage.	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB10	Object. No exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land for 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB11	Object. No exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land for 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB14	Object. No exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land for 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB10	The proposals will remove valuable and pleasant open space between Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	It is recognised that the separation between Hook Heath 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 and the individual character of Hook Heath is well noted in the Heritage of Woking Document and the Character of Woking (2000) study. The Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan also contains specific policies to protect and enhance the character of Hook Heath.  Proposed site GB14 (Land adjacent to Hook Hill Lane) is for the use of Green Infrastructure and not for development. This site will assist in maintaining some open separation between Hook Heath and Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB11	The proposals will remove valuable and pleasant open space between Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	It is recognised that the separation between Hook Heath 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 and the individual character of Hook Heath is well noted in the Heritage of Woking Document and the Character of Woking (2000) study. The Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan also contains specific policies to protect and enhance the character of Hook Heath.  Proposed site GB14 (Land adjacent to Hook Hill Lane) is for the use of Green Infrastructure and not for development. This site will assist in maintaining some open separation between Hook Heath and Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB14	The proposals will remove valuable and pleasant open space between Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	It is recognised that the separation between Hook Heath and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as	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>it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt and the individual character of Hook Heath is well noted in the Heritage of Woking Document and the Character of Woking (2000) study. The Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan also contains specific policies to protect and enhance the character of Hook Heath.</p> <p>Proposed site GB14 (Land adjacent to Hook Hill Lane) is for the use of Green Infrastructure and not for development. This site will assist in maintaining some open separation between Hook Heath and Mayford.</p>	of this representation
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB10	There are no local shops or amenities and residents will be dependant on vehicle usage. This is not consistent with existing policies.	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation is located in close proximity to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre, which currently caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB11	There are no local shops or amenities and residents will be dependant on vehicle usage. This is not consistent with existing policies.	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation is located in close proximity to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre, which currently caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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
1692	Tim	Murnane	GB14	There are no local shops or amenities and residents will be dependant on vehicle usage. This is not consistent with existing policies.	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation is located in close proximity to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre, which currently caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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
197	J	Murphy	GB10	<p>We understand you plan to release all the Green Belt Land on the north side of Saunders Lane and land adjoining Egley Road for high density development and object.</p> <p>This proposal goes further than required by the Core Strategy and object to excessive housing densities, congestion of the local transport infrastructure and urban sprawl. Previous policy was to maintain open spaces between the villages.</p> <p>While not wishing to be "nimby" to necessary development, please retain at least some element of England's "Green &amp; Pleasant Land".</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 general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
197	J	Murphy	GB9	<p>We understand you plan to release all the Green Belt Land on the north side of Saunders Lane and land adjoining Egley Road for high density development and object.</p> <p>This proposal goes further than required by the Core Strategy and object to excessive housing densities, congestion of the local transport infrastructure and urban sprawl. Previous policy was to maintain open spaces between the villages.</p> <p>While not wishing to be "nimby" to necessary development, please retain at least some element of England's "Green &amp; Pleasant Land".</p>	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 Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied based on the available evidence that the proposals can be developed without compromising the overall purpose of the Green Belt or the character of the area. The general approach 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
197	J	Murphy	GB11	<p>We understand you plan to release all the Green Belt Land on the north side of Saunders Lane and land adjoining Egley Road for high density development and object.</p> <p>This proposal goes further than required by the Core Strategy and object to excessive housing densities, congestion of the local transport infrastructure and urban sprawl. Previous policy was to maintain open spaces between the villages.</p> <p>While not wishing to be "nimby" to necessary development, please retain at least some element of England's "Green &amp; Pleasant Land".</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). 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
197	J	Murphy	GB8	<p>We understand you plan to release all the Green Belt Land on the north side of Saunders Lane and land adjoining Egley Road for high density development and object.</p> <p>This proposal goes further than required by the Core Strategy and object to excessive housing densities, congestion of the local transport infrastructure and urban sprawl. Previous policy was to maintain open spaces between the villages.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2, 4. Land has been identified to be safeguarded to meet future needs between 2027 and 2040. The Council believes that this is necessary to protect the permanent endurance of the Green Belt boundary. The manner that infrastructure will be provided to support the proposals is addressed in the Topic Paper, Section 3. Any density that will eventually be approved for the development of the site will take into account the general character of the vicinity where the proposal takes place.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				While not wishing to be "nimby" to necessary development, please retain at least some element of England's "Green & Pleasant Land".			
1353	Philip	Murphy	GB12	Object to proposals in Pyrford. Concerned that the proposals for a significant increase in population will put pressure on the public services including schools , medical facilities and roads, which will have a huge impact on the quality life in Pyrford. The existing roads in Pyrford and West Byfleet are already severely congested and parking is an issue. Local services including medical centre and local shops already struggle.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10 in relation to utilities. In addition the Council will continue to consult with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.  The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1353	Philip	Murphy	GB13	Object to proposals in Pyrford. Concerned that the proposals for a significant increase in population will put pressure on the public services including schools , medical facilities and roads, which will have a huge impact on the quality life in Pyrford. The existing roads in Pyrford and West Byfleet are already severely congested and parking is an issue. Local services including medical centre and local shops already struggle.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10 in relation to utilities. In addition the Council will continue to consult with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.  The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
375	A	Murray	GB12	Pyrford school can not accommodate the additional pupils created by the proposals.	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
375	A	Murray	GB13	Pyrford school can not accommodate the additional pupils created by the proposals.	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
375	A	Murray	GB12	West Byfleet Health Centre is at capacity, it can not meet the health needs of additional people.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
375	A	Murray	GB13	West Byfleet Health Centre is at capacity, it can not meet the health needs of additional people.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
375	A	Murray	GB12	The sites were not recommended for release in the GBBR. Development on these sites would impact on heritage views and landscape features. There is sufficient brownfield sites in Woking and Elmbridge-consider these before the GB	Consider brownfield sites before the release of GB land	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  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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
375	A	Murray	GB13	The sites were not recommended for release in the GBBR. Development on these sites would impact on heritage views and landscape features. There is sufficient brownfield sites in Woking and Elmbridge- consider these before the GB	Consider brownfield sites before the release of GB land	<p>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</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
375	A	Murray	GB13	Object to proposed release of GB land in Pyrford for housing. The local infrastructure will not cope. The roads are beyond capacity, proposals will exacerbate the situation- particularly with other proposals around Wisely, Ripley and Send.	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
375	A	Murray	GB12	Object to proposed release of GB land in Pyrford for housing. The local infrastructure will not cope. The roads are beyond capacity, proposals will exacerbate the situation- particularly with other proposals around Wisely, Ripley and Send.	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 Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	<p>Traveller sites should be close to schools and services as set out in the Core Strategy and SHLAA, this site is not.</p> <p>There is a lack of supporting infrastructure in the area. The development of a communal building for Travellers will not positively enhance the environment and openness of the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a through assessment against all reasonable and deliverable alternatives, this site is considered to be suitable for additional Traveller pitches on what is an existing Traveller site.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	None stated.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.  Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.  Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI and Hoe Stream SNCI and would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites that form the boundary of the land.	None stated.	The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.  The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	<p>The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line.</p> <p>The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.</p>	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development			of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.  The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.  As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.  No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly decontaminated.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the 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
721	Graham	Murray	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.  In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.		<p>measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	<p>The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times.</p> <p>Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.</p>	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	<p>The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times.</p> <p>Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.</p>	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB9	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
721	Graham	Murray	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
721	Graham	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	<p>Traveller sites should be close to schools and services as set out in the Core Strategy and SHLAA, this site is not.</p> <p>There is a lack of supporting infrastructure in the area. The development of a communal building for Travellers will not positively enhance the environment and openness of the area.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy states that it is key that most new development is concentrated in sustainable locations where facilities and services are easily accessible by all relevant modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Following a thorough assessment against all reasonable and deliverable alternatives, this site is considered to be suitable for additional Traveller pitches on what is an existing Traveller site.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council fully acknowledge the existing public transport provision in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes design requirements that will ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the character and landscape setting of the area. The site will also remain within the Green Belt and therefore the design and layout of the proposed allocation will have to be in general conformity with the relevant policies of the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	None stated.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally</p>	No further modification is 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>established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</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
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	<p>The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008.</p> <p>Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI and Hoe Stream SNCI and would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites that form the boundary of the land.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
722	Betty	Murray	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.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 3.0.  The Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.  The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.			of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.  The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.  As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	Other sites identified in the Green Belt Boundary Review for Traveller accommodation have been omitted from the DPD.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations,	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.</p> <p>No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.</p>			of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly decontaminated.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the 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
722	Betty	Murray	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community	No further modification is 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>	
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	<p>The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times.</p> <p>Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths.</p> <p>There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.</p>	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	<p>The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times.</p> <p>Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths.</p> <p>There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.</p>	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	<p>The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times.</p> <p>Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.		<p>proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB8	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.			of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB9	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	GB11	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	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
722	Betty	Murray	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
605	Heather	Mustard	GB10	Objects to the proposals due to lack of demonstration of exceptional circumstances for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, there was no suggestion at that time that land should be released beyond 2027. The 1200 additional homes proposed on these sites is significantly above the Core Strategy requirement.	None stated.	The approach to safeguarding sites to meet future development need from 2027 to 2040 is set out in Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
605	Heather	Mustard	GB11	Objects to the proposals due to lack of demonstration of exceptional circumstances for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, there was no suggestion at that time that land should be released beyond 2027. The 1200 additional homes proposed on these sites is significantly above the Core Strategy requirement.	None stated.	The approach to safeguarding sites to meet future development need from 2027 to 2040 is set out in Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
605	Heather	Mustard	GB14	Objects to the proposals due to lack of demonstration of exceptional circumstances for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, there was no suggestion at that time that land should be released beyond 2027. The 1200 additional homes proposed on these sites is significantly above the Core Strategy requirement.	None stated.	The approach to safeguarding sites to meet future development need from 2027 to 2040 is set out in Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
605	Heather	Mustard	GB11	The road network around Mayford, with its single lane bridges, is insufficient to support an increase in traffic. A professional transport infrastructure assessment is needed to demonstrate consideration of the proposed development's impacts. Google maps travel times are unreliable for thus purpose.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. In addition the journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
605	Heather	Mustard	GB10	The road network around Mayford, with its single lane bridges, is insufficient to support an increase in traffic. A professional transport infrastructure assessment is needed to demonstrate consideration of the proposed development's impacts. Google maps travel times are unreliable for thus purpose.	None stated.	This representation 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 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
605	Heather	Mustard	GB10	Increase in urban sprawl. A major purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging by maintaining open spaces between them. The proposed Green Belt release could only result in the erosion of the gap between Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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
605	Heather	Mustard	GB11	Increase in urban sprawl. A major purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging by maintaining open spaces between them. The proposed Green Belt release could only result in the erosion of the gap between Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
605	Heather	Mustard	GB14	Increase in urban sprawl. A major purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging by maintaining open spaces between them. The proposed Green Belt release could only result in the erosion of the gap between Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
605	Heather	Mustard	GB10	There is a lack of appropriate infrastructure. The GBR's recommendation of sites GB10 and GB11 for development is based of ease of access to the town centre using Google maps travel times. This is an inappropriate source to justify release of land from the Green Belt. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development, including school, retail park and housing on Egley Road.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been 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
605	Heather	Mustard	GB11	There is a lack of appropriate infrastructure. The GBR's recommendation of sites GB10 and GB11 for development is based of ease of access to the town centre using Google maps travel times. This is an inappropriate source to justify release of land from the Green Belt. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development, including school, retail park and housing on Egley Road.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been 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
605	Heather	Mustard	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended sites GB10 and GB11 for development on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, there is a lack of supporting infrastructure e.g. shops or medical facilities. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have their own vehicle, thus adding to local traffic.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
605	Heather	Mustard	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended sites GB10 and GB11 for development on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, there is a lack of supporting infrastructure e.g. shops or medical facilities. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have their own vehicle, thus adding to local traffic.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
714	J	Myall	General	National Planning Policy has already declared that planning should be local, therefore there should be no government imposed additions to the local housing requirement. This is especially so when all main government parties have declared their intention to revitalise the North of England and thus reduce or diminish pressure on expansion in the South East. Thus Woking can decide on its own needs for housing and in view of pressure on local land resources this must only be for a few start up and local service industry employees. The amount of housing suggested for Mayford goes against these policies, and it can only be achieved by violating Green Belt land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.  It should also be noted that the proposed allocations are Safeguarded for future development needs post 2027. This is consistent with the NPPF as addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB8	The local road network will need to be widened to accommodate increased traffic and safe pedestrian and cycling access. All railway crossing will need to be widened and other bottlenecks cleared. Egley Road would need duelling between the Bird in Hand and Turnoak roundabouts at least. The cost of carrying out such works to WBC, SCC and Network Rail would outweigh any possible overall benefit. As a local tax payer I do not wish to contribute to these costs, especially with the current dire state of the Councils' finances.	Significant road infrastructure investments will need to be implemented.	The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network and sources of funding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.  The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB9	The local road network will need to be widened to accommodate increased traffic and safe pedestrian and cycling access. All railway crossing will need to be widened and other bottlenecks cleared. Egley Road would need duelling between the Bird in Hand and Turnoak roundabouts at least. The cost of carrying out such works to WBC, SCC and Network Rail would outweigh any possible overall benefit. As a local tax payer I do not wish to contribute to these costs, especially with the current dire state of the Councils' finances.	Significant road infrastructure investments will need to be implemented.	The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network and sources of funding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.  The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.  The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
714	J	Myall	GB10	The local road network will need to be widened to accommodate increased traffic and safe pedestrian and cycling access. All railway crossing will need to be widened and other bottlenecks cleared. Egley Road would need duelling between the Bird in Hand and Turnoak roundabouts at least. The cost of carrying out such works to WBC, SCC and Network Rail would outweigh any possible overall benefit. As a local tax payer I do not wish to contribute to these costs, especially with the current dire state of the Councils' finances.	Significant road infrastructure investments will need to be implemented.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network and sources of funding 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
714	J	Myall	GB11	The local road network will need to be widened to accommodate increased traffic and safe pedestrian and cycling access. All railway crossing will need to be widened and other bottlenecks cleared. Egley Road would need duelling between the Bird in Hand and Turnoak roundabouts at least. The cost of carrying out such works to WBC, SCC and Network Rail would outweigh any possible overall benefit. As a local tax payer I do not wish to contribute to these costs, especially with the current dire state of the Councils' finances.	Significant road infrastructure investments will need to be implemented.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network and sources of funding 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
714	J	Myall	General	National Policy states that Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, and this has not been proved by WBC. The policy clearly states that housing need, including Travellers sites, does not justify the harm done to 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
714	J	Myall	General	Strongly object to any infrastructure on Green Belt land in Mayford.	None stated.	It should be noted that the Council is not proposing to release Green Belt land for infrastructure purposes. Nevertheless the representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development for residential purposes 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
714	J	Myall	General	Doubt over the actual housing need for this plan period or the next and it is inappropriate to even consider violating Green Belt for housing. I also support the views of Mayford Village Society and those of the Hook Hill Society in rejecting these plans.	None stated.	The housing need and the case for safeguarding land for future development needs are clearly set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. The Council believes that the approach taken is consistent with national planning policy (NPPF).  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
714	J	Myall	GB8	Planning policy requires a 400m buffer between heathland and housing developments. This has not been achieved. The tracks across Prey Heath will be overloaded with pedestrians and cyclists and this delicate wetland, which is also used for cattle grazing, will be unacceptable as a high use route.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.  The Site Allocations DPD does not state that people will be encouraged to use Prey Heath for commuting purposes. The Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. This exact detail of this will be considered and determined at the planning application stage.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
714	J	Myall	GB9	Planning policy requires a 400m buffer between heathland and housing developments. This has not been achieved. The tracks across Prey Heath will be overloaded with pedestrians and cyclists and this delicate wetland, which is also used for cattle grazing, will be unacceptable as a high use route.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.  The Site Allocations DPD does not state that people will be encouraged to use Prey Heath for commuting purposes. The Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. This exact detail of this will be considered and determined at the planning application stage.  During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.  Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.  The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
714	J	Myall	GB10	Planning policy requires a 400m buffer between heathland and housing developments. This has not been achieved. The tracks across Prey Heath will be overloaded with pedestrians and cyclists and this delicate wetland, which is also used for cattle grazing, will be unacceptable as a high use route.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not state that people will be encouraged to use Prey Heath for commuting purposes. The Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. This exact detail of this will be considered and determined at the planning application stage.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB11	Planning policy requires a 400m buffer between heathland and housing developments. This has not been achieved. The tracks across Prey Heath will be overloaded with pedestrians and cyclists and this delicate wetland, which is also used for cattle grazing, will be unacceptable as a high use route.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD does not state that people will be encouraged to use Prey Heath for commuting purposes. The Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. This exact detail of this will be considered and determined at the planning application stage.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB8	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive local shops to accommodate extra housing, including medical facilities. These will need to be mandated if any development occurs on the proposed scale.	Extensive shops and medical facilities would be required.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development 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>	
714	J	Myall	GB9	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive local shops to accommodate extra housing, including medical facilities. These will need to be mandated if any development occurs on the proposed scale.	Extensive shops and medical facilities would be required.	<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
714	J	Myall	GB10	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive local shops to accommodate extra housing, including medical facilities. These will need to be mandated if any development occurs on the proposed scale.	Extensive shops and medical facilities would be required.	<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
714	J	Myall	GB11	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive local shops to accommodate extra housing, including medical facilities. These will need to be mandated if any development occurs on the proposed scale.	Extensive shops and medical facilities would be required.	<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
714	J	Myall	GB8	The local transport barely serves the existing community and near located near enough to any of the proposed development sites to be of value. Worplesdon station car park is already full and would need to be expanded. Changes to the rail network have caused traffic issues at both Worplesdon and Brookwood Stations as commuters beat the overcrowding at Woking Station.	None stated.	<p>It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is limited in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to provide an indication of what infrastructure is anticipated to be required to support forecast growth over the Core Strategy period, where and when it will be provided, by whom and how it will be funded. The Council accepts that the IDP will continue to evolve with new information, for example when the investment plans of other providers are known. Since the IDP was published, Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve rail infrastructure in the Borough. This will inform the future review of the IDP.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB9	The local transport barely serves the existing community and near located near enough to any of the proposed development sites to be of value. Worplesdon station car park is already full and would need to be expanded. Changes to the rail network have caused traffic issues at both Worplesdon and Brookwood Stations as commuters	None stated.	<p>It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is limited in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation



Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				beat the overcrowding at Woking Station.		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to provide an indication of what infrastructure is anticipated to be required to support forecast growth over the Core Strategy period, where and when it will be provided, by whom and how it will be funded. The Council accepts that the IDP will continue to evolve with new information, for example when the investment plans of other providers are known. Since the IDP was published, Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve rail infrastructure in the Borough. This will inform the future review of the IDP.	
714	J	Myall	GB10	The local transport barely serves the existing community and near located near enough to any of the proposed development sites to be of value. Worplesdon station car park is already full and would need to be expanded. Changes to the rail network have caused traffic issues at both Worplesdon and Brookwood Stations as commuters beat the overcrowding at Woking Station.	None stated.	<p>It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is limited in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to provide an indication of what infrastructure is anticipated to be required to support forecast growth over the Core Strategy period, where and when it will be provided, by whom and how it will be funded. The Council accepts that the IDP will continue to evolve with new information, for example when the investment plans of other providers are known. Since the IDP was published, Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve rail infrastructure in the Borough. This will inform the future review of the IDP.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB11	The local transport barely serves the existing community and near located near enough to any of the proposed development sites to be of value. Worplesdon station car park is already full and would need to be expanded. Changes to the rail network have caused traffic issues at both Worplesdon and Brookwood Stations as commuters beat the overcrowding at Woking Station.	None stated.	<p>It is fully acknowledged that the existing public transport is limited in the local area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to provide an indication of what infrastructure is anticipated to be required to support forecast growth over the Core Strategy period, where and when it will be provided, by whom and how it will be funded. The Council accepts that the IDP will continue to evolve with new information, for example when the investment plans of other providers are known. Since the IDP was published, Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve rail infrastructure in the Borough. This will inform the future review of the IDP.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB7	Traveller needs will not be met by expanding this site, which was rejected in the GBBR. The site should be rejected for this and any other infrastructure purpose.	The site should be rejected for this and any other infrastructure purpose.	<p>The need for Traveller pitches has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the site being rejected by professional advisors has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB8	Surrounding new developments taking place at the moment will already exacerbate an already overloaded road system. Journeys into Woking are in excess of the times stated in the GBBR which throws doubt over the validity of the arguments in the documents.	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 has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spend and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the 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.	
714	J	Myall	GB9	Surrounding new developments taking place at the moment will already exacerbate an already overloaded road system. Journeys into Woking are in excess of the times stated in the GBBR which throws doubt over the validity of the arguments in the documents.	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 has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spend and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
714	J	Myall	GB10	Surrounding new developments taking place at the moment will already exacerbate an already overloaded road system. Journeys into Woking are in excess of the times stated in the GBBR which throws doubt over the validity of the arguments in the documents.	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 has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spend and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
714	J	Myall	GB11	Surrounding new developments taking place at the moment will already exacerbate an already overloaded road system. Journeys into Woking are in excess of the times stated in the GBBR which throws doubt over the validity of the arguments in the documents.	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 has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spend and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) 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
						support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
714	J	Myall	GB8	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive changes to accommodate the number of houses proposed. It will no longer be a village and instead be a Woking suburb, losing its 900 year history. The village community will be destroyed and it will become a town.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB9	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive changes to accommodate the number of houses proposed. It will no longer be a village and instead be a Woking suburb, losing its 900 year history. The village community will be destroyed and it will become a town.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB10	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive changes to accommodate the number of houses proposed. It will no longer be a village and instead be a Woking suburb, losing its 900 year history. The village community will be destroyed and it will become a town.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	GB11	Mayford is a rural area and will require extensive changes to accommodate the number of houses proposed. It will no longer be a village and instead be a Woking suburb, losing its 900 year history. The village community will be destroyed and it will become a town.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
714	J	Myall	General	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation