

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1	Planning	Policy Team	DOVSAPS	Site address incomplete for UA2 in Table 2.	Add a postcode to the address for Site UA2 Trizancia House in Table 2 on page 5.	Comment noted and will be corrected.	Add postcode to site address
1	Planning	Policy Team	GB11	GB11 is stated as under single ownership. This is incorrect, the site includes land of the bowling club, village hall and common land as well the main area of land owned by a developer.	None stated.	The ownership of land is not an influential factor in the selection of sites. However, in accordance with national guidance the availability of land is a material consideration.	Change site ownership details
1	Planning	Policy Team	DIA	Page 13 - para 5 'focuses'	Change 'focus' to 'focuses'	Comment noted.	Change 'focus' to 'focuses'
1	Planning	Policy Team	GB2	Correct typo in the first paragraph of the allocation	Change '...is allocated or 6 pitches...' to '...is allocated for 6 pitches...'	Comment noted.	Change '...is allocated or 6 pitches...' to '...is allocated for 6 pitches...'
1	Planning	Policy Team	UA51	Change the allocation to refer to large convenience store or supermarket rather than Waitrose store, to ensure appropriate promotion of town centre uses with regard to national policy.	Change reference in the first paragraph from '...retail (including replacement Waitrose store)' to '...retail (including replacement convenience store or supermarket)'	Noted.	Amend text to read as per comment
1	Planning	Policy Team	General	In light of High Court judgement (publicised 3 August 2015), national affordable housing threshold and the Vacant Building Credit now removed. Need to refer to an Affordable Housing requirement for all developments likely to provide 10 dwellings.	Add reference to an Affordable Housing key requirement for all developments likely to provide 10 net additional dwellings.	In the light of the outcome of the legal challenge to the Government's affordable housing policy, the requirements of Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy will continue to apply.	Amend affordable housing policy requirements where necessary
1	Planning	Policy Team	GB8	There is a lack of explicit sequential approach or assessment of alternative sites to justify this allocation. This should be provided to ensure a robust and credible evidence base, and demonstrate that this is the most appropriate site for education provision.	A thorough site search and analysis for secondary education use should be provided and made public to support the next iteration of the plan.	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.	A thorough site search and analysis for secondary education use should be provided and made public to support the next iteration of the plan.
1	Planning	Policy Team	GB8	Ensure reference to the relocation of the athletics track from Sheerwater, if required, to ensure integration of policies on these two sites.	Insert a bullet point to state 'Opportunity	The school and leisure centre proposal now has planning permission.	Insert a bullet point to state 'Opportunity for the relocation of the

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					for the relocation of the Athletics Track from Sheerwater (as per draft Policy UA32) if required and not retained on at that site'		Athletics Track from Sheerwater (as per draft Policy UA32) if required and not retained on at that site'
36	Simon	Perkins	GB12	Acknowledges the need for housing. Would support a well designed scheme which enables good accessibility to local services (primary school, church, shops etc.) and where residents can walk/cycle New homes/people would strengthen the life of organisation here.	None stated.	The acknowledgment for the need for housing is welcome. The key requirements of the proposals and the robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD will ensure that any development that comes forward is well designed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
36	Simon	Perkins	GB13	Acknowledges the need for housing. Would support a well designed scheme which enables good accessibility to local services (primary school, church, shops etc.) and where residents can walk/cycle New homes/people would strengthen the life of organisation here.	None stated.	The acknowledgment for the need for housing is welcome. The key requirements of the proposals and the robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD will ensure that any development that comes forward is well designed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
40	Nicky	Purnell	GB12	The existing school is massively oversubscribed and existing families in Pyrford don't get places Clubs and social gatherings are full. Beavers/Cubs have over 3 year waiting lists Pyrford is a lovely village and is already overrun. It can't cope with new houses, schools, roads, shops, clubs	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. Overall, the Council believes that there is a clear need for housing to meet identified need and there will the infrastructure to support the development to make them sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
40	Nicky	Purnell	GB13	The existing school is massively oversubscribed and existing families in Pyrford don't get places Clubs and social gatherings are full. Beavers/Cubs have over 3 year waiting lists Pyrford is a lovely village and is already overrun. It can't cope with new houses, schools, roads, shops, clubs	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. Overall, the Council believes that there is a clear need for housing to meet identified need and there will the infrastructure to support the development to make them sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
58	Ben	Parker	GB12	Objects to the proposals as they will result in a large increase in traffic and exacerbate existing congestion and	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet the development needs of the area and the proposals will make a contribution towards that and also ensure the enduring	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>access issues.</p> <p>Refers to the potential adverse affect to traffic flow in specific locations: when turning right out of Norfolk Farm Road on to Old Woking Road; and on the narrow Pyrford Common Road particularly at peak times.</p>		<p>permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Council acknowledge that Pyrford has a distinctive character and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt and it is not expected that the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt will be undermined by the proposals. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.</p>	of this representation
58	Ben	Parker	GB12	<p>Raises concern about the proposals for housing development due to extra demand on local facilities, and exacerbation of existing issues. Points to recent development in the area that has already increased the local population.</p>	None stated.	<p>The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
58	Ben	Parker	GB12	<p>Objects to the proposals for housing development due to the erosion of the Green Belt and further urban sprawl.</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 proposals can be developed without undermining the landscape character of the area. This particular issues is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
58	Ben	Parker	GB13	<p>Objects to the proposals as they will result in a large increase in traffic and exacerbate existing congestion and access issues.</p> <p>Refers to the potential adverse affect to traffic flow in specific locations: when turning right out of Norfolk Farm Road on to Old Woking Road; and on the narrow Pyrford Common Road particularly at peak times.</p>	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
58	Ben	Parker	GB13	Raises concern about the proposals for housing development due to extra demand on local facilities, and exacerbation of existing issues. Points to recent development in the area that has already increased the local population.	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
58	Ben	Parker	GB13	Objects to the proposals for housing development due to the erosion of the Green Belt and further urban sprawl.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB15	Traffic volume is already excessive, and further development would make the situation worse. A new by-pass is required to relieve congestion and should be funded by the development. Sites should be excluded from the Site Allocations DPD if the infrastructure is inadequate. All future infrastructure should be in place before development takes place.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate. Assess infrastructure first before allocating any site for development.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB16	Traffic volume is already excessive, and further development would make the situation worse. A new by-pass is required to relieve congestion and should be funded by the development. Sites should be excluded from the Site Allocations DPD if the infrastructure is inadequate. All future infrastructure should be in place before development takes place.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate. Assess infrastructure first before allocating any site for development.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB4	Traffic volume is already excessive, and further development would make the situation worse. A new by-pass is required to relieve congestion and should be funded by the development. Sites should be excluded from the Site Allocations DPD if the infrastructure is inadequate. All future infrastructure should be in place before development takes place.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate. Assess infrastructure first before allocating any site for development.	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 justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB5	Traffic volume is already excessive, and further development would make the situation worse. A new by-pass is required to relieve congestion and should be funded by the development. Sites should be excluded from the Site Allocations DPD if the infrastructure is inadequate. All future infrastructure should be in place before development takes place.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate. Assess infrastructure first before allocating any site for development.	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 justification for the release 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
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB12	Traffic volume is already excessive, and further development would make the situation worse. A new by-pass is required to relieve congestion and should be funded by the development. Sites should be excluded from the Site Allocations DPD if the infrastructure is inadequate. All future infrastructure should be in place before development takes place.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate. Assess infrastructure first before allocating any site for development.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB13	Traffic volume is already excessive, and further development would make the situation worse. A new by-pass is required to relieve congestion and should be funded by the development. Sites should be excluded from the Site Allocations DPD if the infrastructure is inadequate. All future infrastructure should be in place before development takes place.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate. Assess infrastructure first before allocating any site for development.	The justification for the release 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
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB4	Health and education facilities should be in place before development takes place. The existing doctors waiting time is unacceptable.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB5	Health and education facilities should be in place before development takes place. The existing doctors waiting time is unacceptable.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB12	Health and education facilities should be in place before development takes place. The existing doctors waiting time is unacceptable.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate.	The implications for infrastructure as a result of the development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB13	Health and education facilities should be in place before development takes place. The existing doctors waiting time is unacceptable.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate.	The approach to infrastructure provision to support the development proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB15	Health and education facilities should be in place before development takes place. The existing doctors waiting time is unacceptable.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
73	Nigel	Pitt	GB16	Health and education facilities should be in place before development takes place. The existing doctors waiting time is unacceptable.	Exclude sites for development where the existing infrastructure is inadequate.	The infrastructure and traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 3 and 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
75	Giovanni	Piccirillo	GB12	Keep Pyrford as it is with Green Belt and open space. New development would have a negative impact on the character of the village.	sorry no proposed modification just a plain objection to this	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
75	Giovanni	Piccirillo	GB13	Keep Pyrford as it is with Green Belt and open space. New development would have a negative impact on the character of the village.	sorry no proposed modification just a plain objection to this	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
75	Giovanni	Piccirillo	GB12	Unclear on the future infrastructure provision	sorry no proposed modification just a plain objection to this	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
75	Giovanni	Piccirillo	GB13	Unclear on the future infrastructure provision	sorry no proposed modification just a plain objection to this	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
75	Giovanni	Piccirillo	General	The cumulative impact of development would have an impact on sustainability	None stated.	A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out, which assesses the cumulative impacts of the proposed allocations. There are also other studies such as the Transport Assessment to ensure that cumulative impacts are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures introduced to address adverse impacts. The key requirements of each proposal will ensure the sustainable development of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
75	Giovanni	Piccirillo	General	The cumulative impact of development would have an impact on sustainability	None stated.	A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out, which assesses the cumulative impacts of the proposed allocations. There are also other studies such as the Transport Assessment to ensure that cumulative impacts are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures introduced to address adverse impacts. The key requirements of each proposal will ensure the sustainable development of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
75	Giovanni	Piccirillo	AGEN	Please don't ruin Green Belt areas	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council's believes that the proposals will ultimate ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB10	GB10 and GB11 are GB and must remain so. The fields drain into Saunders Lane and after heavy rain causes flooding to gardens and some bungalows. Despite numerous attempts, WBC has not addressed the existing problem and any new residential development here will greatly exacerbate the flooding problem	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. Flooding matters are covered in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB11	GB10 and GB11 are GB and must remain so. The fields drain into Saunders Lane and after heavy rain causes flooding to gardens and some bungalows. Despite numerous attempts, WBC has not addressed the existing problem and any new residential development here will greatly exacerbate the flooding problem	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 flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. The comments about the existing situation will be passed on the to the relevant Officers of the Council to consider.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB7	Woking already has three travellers sites so further development at Ten Acre Farm is inappropriate.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB7	Central Govt issued guidelines to Councils in Oct 2014 to protect GB. WBC have ignored this. Saunders Lane is not an appropriate site for the proposed development	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The DPD has been prepared to be in general conformity with national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
83	Linda	Povey	GB7	Local infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient to accommodate the proposed development. There are few shops, medical facility and transport links are poor	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB7	Saunders Lane is narrow and could not cope with extra traffic generated by 500 new homes. There are already existing traffic problems e.g. near Wyevale Garden Centre will be made worse by the proposed school and proposed houses.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB8	Central Govt issued guidelines to Councils in Oct 2014 to protect GB. WBC have ignored this. Saunders Lane is not an appropriate site for the proposed development	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB8	Local infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient to accommodate the proposed development. There are few shops, medical facility and transport links are poor	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
83	Linda	Povey	GB8	Saunders Lane is narrow and could not cope with extra traffic generated by 500 new homes. There are already existing traffic problems e.g. near Wyevale Garden Centre will be made worse by the proposed school and proposed houses.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB9	Central Govt issued guidelines to Councils in Oct 2014 to protect GB. WBC have ignored this. Saunders Lane is not an appropriate site for the proposed development	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 3 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB9	Local infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient to accommodate the proposed development. There are few shops, medical facility and transport links are poor	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
83	Linda	Povey	GB9	Saunders Lane is narrow and could not cope with extra traffic generated by 500 new homes. There are already existing traffic problems e.g. near Wyevale Garden Centre will be made worse by the proposed school and proposed houses.	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
83	Linda	Povey	GB10	Central Govt issued guidelines to Councils in Oct 2014 to protect GB. WBC have ignored this. Saunders Lane is not an appropriate site for the proposed development	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
83	Linda	Povey	GB10	Local infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient to accommodate the proposed development. There are few shops, medical facility and transport links are poor	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB10	Saunders Lane is narrow and could not cope with extra traffic generated by 500 new homes. There are already existing traffic problems e.g. near Wyevale Garden Centre will be made worse by the proposed school and proposed houses.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB11	Central Govt issued guidelines to Councils in Oct 2014 to protect GB. WBC have ignored this. Saunders Lane is not an appropriate site for the proposed development	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
83	Linda	Povey	GB11	Local infrastructure in Mayford is insufficient to accommodate the proposed development. There are few shops, medical facility and transport links are poor	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	No further modification is 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>Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>	
83	Linda	Povey	GB11	Saunders Lane is narrow and could not cope with extra traffic generated by 500 new homes. There are already existing traffic problems e.g. near Wyevale Garden Centre will be made worse by the proposed school and proposed houses.	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
147	Thomas	Pettit	GB4	Strongly oppose any further building in or around Byfleet Village, especially on land that has be designated 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
147	Thomas	Pettit	GB5	Strongly oppose any further building in or around Byfleet Village, especially on land that has be designated 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
178	Graham	Phillips	General	Green Belt used to be a very strong, almost sacrosanct planning constraint. I appreciate there are externally defined housing targets to be met, however now the implication Woking will have to use some Green Belt land for housing is clear, these could be revised downwards.	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. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet developments. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet future needs. The overall objectively assessed housing need for the area was 594 when the Core Strategy was adopted and 517 by the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Woking is only meeting about half of its housing need. It will be difficult to justify a lower housing requirement based on the available information.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
178	Graham	Phillips	General	I object to all housing proposed or intended in the Green Belt (GB1 to GB5 and GB7 to GB16). If the housing target involves using Green Belt for housing development then this is too high and should be reduced.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield land to meet developments. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet future needs. The overall objectively assessed housing need for the area was 594 when the Core Strategy was adopted and 517 by the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Woking is only meeting about half of its housing need. It will be difficult to justify a lower housing requirement based on the available information.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
178	Graham	Phillips	GB6	This road junction upgrade seems reasonable, I do not object.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
178	Graham	Phillips	General	The DPD has made comprehensive efforts to identify housing sites inside the urban area and I have no comments on these. I am concerned about the sites identified in the Green Belt for release or safeguarding between 2022 and 2040.	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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/SHLAAB019b 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
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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	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	No further modification is 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.	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).	
186	Thelma	Powell	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.	The justification for 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. 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
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	GB7	I have seen many changes in the Village but none so drastic as those proposed. It will be the end of Mayford Village, which will become an extension of Woking. I strongly oppose.	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's 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
186	Thelma	Powell	GB10	If these drastic plans go ahead it will be the end of Mayford village and we will become an extension of Woking; this must not happen, I strongly oppose.	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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the landscape character or setting of the area or its heritage assets. this matter are addressed in detail in Sections 7 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council does not think that the proposals will undermine the distinctive character of Mayford. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	GB11	If these drastic plans go ahead it will be the end of Mayford village and we will become an extension of Woking; this must not happen, I strongly oppose.	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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the landscape character or setting of the area or its heritage assets. this matter are addressed in detail in Sections 7 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council does not think that the proposals will undermine the distinctive character of Mayford. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	GB8	If these drastic plans go ahead it will be the end of Mayford village and we will become an extension of Woking; this must not happen, I strongly oppose.	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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the landscape character or setting of the area or its heritage assets. this matter are addressed in detail in Sections 7 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council does not think that the proposals will undermine the distinctive character of Mayford. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	GB9	If these drastic plans go ahead it will be the end of Mayford village and we will become an extension of Woking; this must not happen, I strongly oppose.	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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the landscape character or setting of the area or its heritage assets. this matter are addressed in detail in Sections 7 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council does not think that the proposals will undermine the distinctive character of Mayford. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	GB11	Mayford lacks the infrastructure to cope with this increased population and school traffic. There are no plans to upgrade road or rail infrastructure. There will be gridlock. 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.	The Council has used a range of evidence base to inform the Site Allocations DPD, including the Green Belt boundary review report. The Council believes that the Green Belt boundary review report is robust to provide reliable information to inform the DPD. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet its development needs. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the Core Strategy period. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Green Belt boundary review adopts the right approach to assessing the landscape implications for accommodating development on the proposed allocated sites. Since the DPD was published for Regulation 18 consultation, the Council has published a Borough-wide landscape assessment. There is nothing in this study that will change the decision made by the Council on landscape grounds. The Green Belt boundary review was a comprehensive review of the entire Green Belt. The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative sites in the Green Belt. The proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	GB10	Mayford lacks the infrastructure to cope with this increased population and school traffic. There are no plans to upgrade road or rail infrastructure. There will be gridlock. 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.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
186	Thelma	Powell	GB8	Mayford lacks the infrastructure to cope with this increased population and school traffic. There are no plans to upgrade road or rail infrastructure. There will be gridlock. 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.	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
186	Thelma	Powell	GB9	Mayford lacks the infrastructure to cope with this increased population and school traffic. There are no plans to upgrade road or rail infrastructure. There will be gridlock. 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.	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
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	GB7	Strongly object to the proposal to increase the number of Traveller Pitches on this land. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford. It is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common used for leisure purposes. Applications to enlarge this site have been refused on Green Belt openness grounds. There must be other sites that do not encroach on Green Belt.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	GB9	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. We will lose ALL OF OUR Green Belt and Mayford village will become an extension of Woking, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	GB11	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. We will lose ALL OF OUR Green Belt and Mayford village will become an extension of Woking, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	
186	Thelma	Powell	GB8	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. We will lose ALL OF OUR Green Belt and Mayford village will become an extension of Woking, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. We will lose ALL OF OUR Green Belt and Mayford village will become an extension of Woking, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The issue about the separation between Woking and Guildford is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	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
186	Thelma	Powell	GB7	Sequential approach has not been undertaken - The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches. No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the ONLY sites put forward.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
186	Thelma	Powell	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and the general amenity to occupiers.	No further modification is 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 be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD.		
190		Pearman	General	The South East is already more populated than the rest of the UK, development on this scale should go to those other areas.	None stated.	The proposals in the site Allocations DPD is identified to meet locally identified housing and other development needs. Woking is presently meeting only 292 a year of its objectively assessed housing need of 517. The unmet need is supposed to be accommodated in other areas. It is important that sufficient land is provided to enable the delivery of the housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
190		Pearman	GB7	There are proposals for further Traveller Pitches in our area. Travellers impact an area. We have far more than a reasonable number concentrated in our area.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
190		Pearman	GB10	The proposals will impact our surrounding area. Local facilities already do not cope, specifically roads, schools, hospitals, doctors and dentists. Electricity, water and sewage facilities are stretched, any further development may cause problems to existing dwellings. Inconceivable that it is right to further develop areas between and join up Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the evidence demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt which include preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another, and is satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
190		Pearman	GB11	The proposals will impact our surrounding area. Local facilities already do not cope, specifically roads, schools, hospitals, doctors and dentists. Electricity, water and sewage facilities are stretched, any further development may cause problems to existing dwellings. Inconceivable that it is right to further develop areas between and join up Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the evidence demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt which include preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another, and is satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
190		Pearman	GB8	The proposals will impact our surrounding area. Local facilities already do not cope, specifically roads, schools, hospitals, doctors and dentists. Electricity, water and sewage facilities are stretched, any further development may cause problems to existing dwellings. Inconceivable that it is right to further develop areas between and join up Woking and Guildford.	None stated.	The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the evidence demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt which include preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another, and is satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
190		Pearman	GB9	The proposals will impact our surrounding area. Local facilities already do not cope, specifically roads, schools,	None stated.	The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has carried out an assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. This is set out in	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				hospitals, doctors and dentists. Electricity, water and sewage facilities are stretched, any further development may cause problems to existing dwellings. Inconceivable that it is right to further develop areas between and join up Woking and Guildford.		Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the evidence demonstrates that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt and/or the character of the area. The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt which include preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another, and is satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised.	of this representation
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB15	Schools, accessible health services, police should have urgent attention.	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
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB16	Schools, accessible health services, police should have urgent attention.	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
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB15	I object to Woking's DPD, particularly as it applies to West Byfleet. It is vital to maintain the principles of the Green Belt to preserve our countryside in the future.	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
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB16	I object to Woking's DPD, particularly as it applies to West Byfleet. It is vital to maintain the principles of the Green Belt to preserve our countryside in the future.	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
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB15	Woking Borough Council's survey of building sites for dwellings failed to look stringently at all brownfield sites, concentrating on easy to sell Green Belt sites. The possibility of using redundant office buildings for dwellings, through redevelopment or conversion, was not looked at closely.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB16	Woking Borough Council's survey of building sites for dwellings failed to look stringently at all brownfield sites, concentrating on easy to sell Green Belt sites. The possibility of using redundant office buildings for dwellings, through redevelopment or conversion, was not looked at closely.	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
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB15	Vital that infrastructure should be carefully studied before any contracts are agreed: road access for many extra cars, inconceivable the narrow Parvis Road will be able to cope with the extra traffic; pressure on water supply, sewage, drainage and possible flooding. If Woking Borough Council is not responsible for this, why not?	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
220	Eileen	Perryer	GB16	Vital that infrastructure should be carefully studied before any contracts are agreed: road access for many extra cars, inconceivable the narrow Parvis Road will be able to cope	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				with the extra traffic; pressure on water supply, sewage, drainage and possible flooding. If Woking Borough Council is not responsible for this, why not?		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.	
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a comprehensive assessment of brownfield land in the urban area to meet the future development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a comprehensive assessment of brownfield land in the urban area to meet the future development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a comprehensive assessment of brownfield land in the urban area to meet the future development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a comprehensive assessment of brownfield land in the urban area to meet the future development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a comprehensive assessment of brownfield land in the urban area to meet the future development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB7	There are already three Traveller sites south of Woking, further expansion in Mayford cannot be justified.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The DPD has not led to an increase in the number of Traveller sites in the Borough. It will however be intensifying the use of existing sites, and the Council accepts that this will lead to an increase in the number of pitches and consequently Travellers population in this part of the Borough. The existing sites have so far been well managed and there is every indication that they will continue to be well managed when additional pitches are delivered. The Council believes that the proposed site allocations relatively offer the most sustainable locations to meet Travellers accommodation needs when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB7	A Traveller site should have adequate amenity and space for business. Smarts Heath Road is a residential area, where business activities are inappropriate.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	Removal of these sites from the Green Belt may only represent a small fraction of Woking's Green Belt but it would comprise over half of Mayford's green space, changing its character.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	Removal of these sites from the Green Belt may only represent a small fraction of Woking's Green Belt but it would comprise over half of Mayford's green space, changing its character.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	Removal of these sites from the Green Belt may only represent a small fraction of Woking's Green Belt but it would comprise over half of Mayford's green space, changing its character.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	Removal of these sites from the Green Belt may only represent a small fraction of Woking's Green Belt but it would comprise over half of Mayford's green space, changing its character.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	Removal of these sites from the Green Belt may only represent a small fraction of Woking's Green Belt but it would comprise over half of Mayford's green space, changing its character.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives as evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB7	There is no evidence of urban or urban fringe sites in Woking having been considered for Travellers.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	A key purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and joining up of communities. Release of this Green Belt would be one step closer to Woking and Guildford merging.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The proposed sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to prevent urban sprawl. The Council is satisfied that based on the evidence, the proposals will not significantly compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	A key purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and joining up of communities. Release of this Green Belt would be one step closer to Woking and Guildford merging.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The proposed sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to prevent urban sprawl. The Council is satisfied that based on the evidence, the proposals will not significantly compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	A key purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and joining up of communities. Release of this Green Belt would be one step closer to Woking and Guildford merging.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The proposed sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to prevent urban sprawl. The Council is satisfied that based on the evidence, the proposals will not significantly compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	A key purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and joining up of communities. Release of this Green Belt would be one step closer to Woking and Guildford merging.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The proposed sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to prevent urban sprawl. The Council is satisfied that based on the evidence, the proposals will not significantly compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	A key purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and joining up of communities. Release of this Green Belt would be one step closer to Woking and Guildford merging.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The proposed sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to prevent urban sprawl. The Council is satisfied that based on the evidence, the proposals will not significantly compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath and Prey Heath Commons (SSSI) used for recreation by local residents. Increasing the number of pitches would affect flora and fauna, visual amenity and character irreversibly.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	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
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	There are several inaccuracies, omissions and inconsistencies in the Green Belt Review: (i) land north of Saunders Lane is "Escarpments and Rising	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	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	No further modification is 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>Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policies NE7 and CS24) which should not be considered for development.</p> <p>(ii) the report has recommended land for release from the Green Belt, including in Mayford, ignoring its constraints.</p> <p>(iii) also ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document (2009).</p> <p>(iv) report only considers sites offered for development, ignoring those available now or by 2027. Land ownership is irrelevant in determining whether land should be in or out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>(v) local transport assessment has not been done by anyone familiar with the actual situation.</p> <p>(vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Guildford. The report incorrectly only classifies this as "important".</p>		<p>to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	<p>There are several inaccuracies, omissions and inconsistencies in the Green Belt Review:</p> <p>(i) land north of Saunders Lane is "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policies NE7 and CS24) which should not be considered for development.</p> <p>(ii) the report has recommended land for release from the Green Belt, including in Mayford, ignoring its constraints.</p> <p>(iii) also ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document (2009).</p> <p>(iv) report only considers sites offered for development, ignoring those available now or by 2027. Land ownership is irrelevant in determining whether land should be in or out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>(v) local transport assessment has not been done by anyone familiar with the actual situation.</p> <p>(vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Guildford. The report incorrectly only classifies this as "important".</p>	<p>The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.</p>	<p>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. Ownership of land has not influenced the allocation of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 20.</p>	<p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	<p>There are several inaccuracies, omissions and inconsistencies in the Green Belt Review:</p> <p>(i) land north of Saunders Lane is "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policies NE7 and CS24) which should not be considered for development.</p> <p>(ii) the report has recommended land for release from the Green Belt, including in Mayford, ignoring its constraints.</p> <p>(iii) also ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document (2009).</p> <p>(iv) report only considers sites offered for development, ignoring those available now or by 2027. Land ownership is irrelevant in determining whether land should be in or out of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.</p>	<p>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 traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposal will not undermine the separation of Mayford from Guildford. This is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</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
				<p>(v) local transport assessment has not been done by anyone familiar with the actual situation.</p> <p>(vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Guildford. The report incorrectly only classifies this as "important".</p>			
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	<p>There are several inaccuracies, omissions and inconsistencies in the Green Belt Review:</p> <p>(i) land north of Saunders Lane is "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policies NE7 and CS24) which should not be considered for development.</p> <p>(ii) the report has recommended land for release from the Green Belt, including in Mayford, ignoring its constraints.</p> <p>(iii) also ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document (2009).</p> <p>(iv) report only considers sites offered for development, ignoring those available now or by 2027. Land ownership is irrelevant in determining whether land should be in or out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>(v) local transport assessment has not been done by anyone familiar with the actual situation.</p> <p>(vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Guildford. The report incorrectly only classifies this as "important".</p>	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposal will not undermine the separation of Mayford from Guildford. This is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	<p>(e) there are several inaccuracies, omissions and inconsistencies in the Green Belt Review:</p> <p>(i) land north of Saunders Lane is "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policies NE7 and CS24) which should not be considered for development.</p> <p>(ii) the report has recommended land for release from the Green Belt, including in Mayford, ignoring its constraints.</p> <p>(iii) also ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document (2009).</p> <p>(iv) report only considers sites offered for development, ignoring those available now or by 2027. Land ownership is irrelevant in determining whether land should be in or out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>(v) local transport assessment has not been done by anyone familiar with the actual situation.</p> <p>(vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking and Guildford. The report incorrectly only classifies this as "important".</p>	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The representation including the landscape implications of the proposals 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. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. this matter has been addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implication of the proposals are addressed in Section 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the separation of Mayford and Guildford, and Mayford will continue to retain its identity. This matter is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	No consideration given to handling surface water from the sloping land in GB10, 11 and 14. Saunders Lane floods after prolonged heavy rain. There is no evidence the need for a major change in routing flood water is acknowledged.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	No consideration given to handling surface water from the sloping land in GB10, 11 and 14. Saunders Lane floods after prolonged heavy rain. There is no evidence the need for a major change in routing flood water is acknowledged.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	No consideration given to handling surface water from the sloping land in GB10, 11 and 14. Saunders Lane floods after prolonged heavy rain. There is no evidence the need for a major change in routing flood water is acknowledged.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	No consideration given to handling surface water from the sloping land in GB10, 11 and 14. Saunders Lane floods after prolonged heavy rain. There is no evidence the need for a major change in routing flood water is acknowledged.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	No consideration given to handling surface water from the sloping land in GB10, 11 and 14. Saunders Lane floods after prolonged heavy rain. There is no evidence the need for a major change in routing flood water is acknowledged.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, the key requirements to make any development of the sites acceptable includes to manage surface water run off. This includes the introduction of Sustainable Drainage Systems.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	Mayford's road network is unable to support a significant increase in traffic. There are single lane bridges, traffic lights, heavy traffic. Creation of a suitable access would be very expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The general approach to traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	Mayford's road network is unable to support a significant increase in traffic. There are single lane bridges, traffic lights, heavy traffic. Creation of a suitable access would be very expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The general approach to traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	Mayford's road network is unable to support a significant increase in traffic. There are single lane bridges, traffic lights, heavy traffic. Creation of a suitable access would be very expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The general approach to traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	Mayford's road network is unable to support a significant increase in traffic. There are single lane bridges, traffic lights, heavy traffic. Creation of a suitable access would be very expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The general approach to traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	Mayford's road network is unable to support a significant increase in traffic. There are single lane bridges, traffic lights, heavy traffic. Creation of a suitable access would be very expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The general approach to traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed comprehensively in Section 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	Development on GB8 and GB9 and then GB10, GB11 and GB14 would add more traffic to an already overloaded A320. Access to Worplesdon railway station is impractical on foot due to lack of pavements.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	Development on GB8 and GB9 and then GB10, GB11 and GB14 would add more traffic to an already overloaded A320. Access to Worplesdon railway station is impractical on foot due to lack of pavements.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	Development on GB8 and GB9 and then GB10, GB11 and GB14 would add more traffic to an already overloaded A320. Access to Worplesdon railway station is impractical on foot due to lack of pavements.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	Development on GB8 and GB9 and then GB10, GB11 and GB14 would add more traffic to an already overloaded A320. Access to Worplesdon railway station is impractical on foot due to lack of pavements.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	Development on GB8 and GB9 and then GB10, GB11 and GB14 would add more traffic to an already overloaded A320. Access to Worplesdon railway station is impractical on foot due to lack of pavements.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	The Council is inconsistent in its consideration of the Green Belt Boundary Review report. It accepts some recommendations (e.g. land in Mayford) but does not accept others (e.g. recommendation to reject land at Ten Acre Farm). Request reconsider the plans, which would have a	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The Council does see any inconsistency in the decisions it has made about the Site Allocations DPD. The general approach to how the Council has addressed the accommodation needs of Travellers is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The 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	No further modification is 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>damaging, irreversible effect on Mayford.</p> <p>The consequences for infrastructure necessary, destruction of visual amenity and major change to character would cause Mayford's loss as a village.</p> <p>Green Belt is precious, every effort must be made to preserve it. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.</p>		<p>Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>	
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	<p>The Council is inconsistent in its consideration of the Green Belt Boundary Review report. It accepts some recommendations (e.g. land in Mayford) but does not accept others (e.g. recommendation to reject land at Ten Acre Farm). Request reconsider the plans, which would have a damaging, irreversible effect on Mayford.</p> <p>The consequences for infrastructure necessary, destruction of visual amenity and major change to character would cause Mayford's loss as a village.</p> <p>Green Belt is precious, every effort must be made to preserve it. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.</p>	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	<p>The Council has not been inconsistent in its decisions. It has used various evidence base to inform the Site Allocations. The evidence supports the allocation of Ten Acre Farm to meet the needs of Travellers. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The 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. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the character of the area. The Core Strategy has robust policies to protect the character of Mayford.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	<p>The Council is inconsistent in its consideration of the Green Belt Boundary Review report. It accepts some recommendations (e.g. land in Mayford) but does not accept others (e.g. recommendation to reject land at Ten Acre Farm). Request reconsider the plans, which would have a damaging, irreversible effect on Mayford.</p> <p>The consequences for infrastructure necessary, destruction of visual amenity and major change to character would cause Mayford's loss as a village.</p> <p>Green Belt is precious, every effort must be made to preserve it. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.</p>	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	<p>The Council has used various evidence base studies to inform the DPD. The Green Belt boundary review is an important part of them. Where the Council had not accepted the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report, reasons have been provided in a transparent manner. Having said that, the Council has not been inconsistent in its decision. The Sustainability Appraisal Report includes reasons why specific site have been allocated or rejected. 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</p>	No further modification is 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	
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	<p>The Council is inconsistent in its consideration of the Green Belt Boundary Review report. It accepts some recommendations (e.g. land in Mayford) but does not accept others (e.g. recommendation to reject land at Ten Acre Farm). Request reconsider the plans, which would have a damaging, irreversible effect on Mayford.</p> <p>The consequences for infrastructure necessary, destruction of visual amenity and major change to character would cause Mayford's loss as a village.</p> <p>Green Belt is precious, every effort must be made to preserve it. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.</p>	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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). 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	<p>The Council is inconsistent in its consideration of the Green Belt Boundary Review report. It accepts some recommendations (e.g. land in Mayford) but does not accept others (e.g. recommendation to reject land at Ten Acre Farm). Request reconsider the plans, which would have a damaging, irreversible effect on Mayford.</p> <p>The consequences for infrastructure necessary, destruction of visual amenity and major change to character would cause Mayford's loss as a village.</p> <p>Green Belt is precious, every effort must be made to preserve it. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.</p>	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
238	Susan	Punch	GB7	I moved here principally because of the rural peaceful character and unspoilt countryside. Planning proposals will impact severely on Mayford. I strongly object to proposed increase in Traveller Pitches because Traveller sites should have safe access to schools and facilities (neither exists).	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB14	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 as this would be contrary to 2014 Central Government guidance to councils on Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have	The Council is requested to reconsider its	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				not been proved by the Council, particularly given policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	plans.		
238	Susan	Punch	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 as this would be contrary to 2014 Central Government guidance to councils on Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have not been proved by the Council, particularly given policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 as this would be contrary to 2014 Central Government guidance to councils on Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have not been proved by the Council, particularly given policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 as this would be contrary to 2014 Central Government guidance to councils on Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have not been proved by the Council, particularly given policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm of inappropriate development.	The Council is requested to reconsider its 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
238	Susan	Punch	GB10	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 as this would be contrary to 2014 Central Government guidance to councils on Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have not been proved by the Council, particularly given policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	The Council is requested to reconsider its plans.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flooding implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	Please reconsider your plans	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
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt. However no urban sites appear to have been considered - there must be doubt as to the validity of no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable. Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to sites on the edge of the urban area that benefit from good access to jobs, shops and other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. This matter has been comprehensively been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is 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 not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.	
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB7	I strongly object. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	Strongly object to associated leisure centre, running track, football and other sports pitches, cafe, associated car parking and access provisions. Totally inappropriate development in residential area. Do not meet 800m separation policy. There would be substantial traffic increase on already overloaded road system, especially at peak times. Unfortunate lack of transparency by the Council.	Please reconsider your plans	The proposed school and leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating that it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking (estimated using Google Maps timings). At peak hours actual travel time is over half an hour. Mayford has a poor road network that is heavily congested at peak times. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Development will exacerbate this.	Please reconsider your plans	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	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.	Please reconsider your plans	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic. Worplesdon rail station would notice a major increase in congestion.	Please reconsider your plans	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	Please reconsider your plans	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site)	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB11	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	Please reconsider your plans	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10. The approach taken to meet the needs of Travellers is addressed in Section 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB11	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate	Please reconsider	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	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
				flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	your plans	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.	of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	Please reconsider your plans	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, the impact on the character of this isolated village community. Development will have a disproportionate, totally unjustifiable impact on residents, who chose to live in a semi-rural not urban environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flooding implications of the proposals is addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic implications is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11, which will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or impact on its character. Residents chose to live in a semi-rural, not urban, environment.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	I accept the proposed secondary school is a special purpose allowed in Green Belt and support the school proposal including mitigation for traffic congestion, visual and noise pollution, safety measures for students and the public, flooding and run-off.	Please reconsider your plans	Support is noted. The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB11	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has always been clear that the Egley Road site is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on	Please reconsider your plans	The Council has always been clear that the site at Egley Road referred to is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	Please reconsider your plans	The school proposal now has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB10	<p>The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and as stated above is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.</p>	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for its occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 25 houses, with two Grade Two listed buildings near Ten Acre Farm. Travellers related business activities are out of keeping.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB7	Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools. It does not have easy access to local facilities.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
240	Taylor	Pinto	GB8	I accept the proposed secondary school is a special purpose allowed in Green Belt and support the school proposal including mitigation for traffic congestion, visual and noise pollution, safety measures for students and the public, flooding and run-off. Strongly object to associated leisure centre, running track, football and other sports pitches, cafe, associated car parking and access provisions. Totally inappropriate development in residential area. Do not meet 800m separation policy. There would be substantial traffic increase on already overloaded road system, especially at peak times. Unfortunate lack of transparency by the Council.	None stated.	The school now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
254	S	Parmar	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
254	S	Parmar	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
254	S	Parmar	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
254	S	Parmar	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
254	S	Parmar	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
254	S	Parmar	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
271	B	Parmar	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
271	B	Parmar	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
271	B	Parmar	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
271	B	Parmar	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
271	B	Parmar	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
271	B	Parmar	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
274	Andre	Payne	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>	
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has draft policies in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) to ensure a healthy built environment, including Policies DM5-DM8 to mitigate against various types of pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
274	Andre	Payne	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
283	M R	Pal	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
283	M R	Pal	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
283	M R	Pal	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
283	M R	Pal	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
356	G	Prentice	GB10	Council policy CS24 requires that development proposals conserve and secure positive benefits in terms of landscape and townscape character. Regard needs to be had for this.	None stated.	The Council emphasises that policy requirements set out in the Core Strategy, including CS24 will apply to sites allocated for future development. Please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
356	G	Prentice	GB11	Council policy CS24 requires that development proposals conserve and secure positive benefits in terms of landscape and townscape character. Regard needs to be had for this.	None stated.	The Council emphasises that policy requirements set out in the Core Strategy, including CS24 will apply to sites allocated for future development. Please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
356	G	Prentice	GB14	Council policy CS24 requires that development proposals conserve and secure positive benefits in terms of landscape and townscape character. Regard needs to be had for this.	None stated.	The Council emphasises that policy requirements set out in the Core Strategy, including CS24 will apply to sites allocated for future development. Please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
356	G	Prentice	GB10	The Council should seek to pro-actively protect the GB not the opposite. The Core Strategy identifies a need for 550 units on the GB by 2027. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for 1200 houses beyond 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
356	G	Prentice	GB11	The Council should seek to pro-actively protect the GB not the opposite. The Core Strategy identifies a need for 550 units on the GB by 2027. Exceptional circumstances have 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 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
				demonstrated for 1200 houses beyond 2027.			
356	G	Prentice	GB14	The Council should seek to pro-actively protect the GB not the opposite. The Core Strategy identifies a need for 550 units on the GB by 2027. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for 1200 houses beyond 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
356	G	Prentice	GB10	Development proposals will put a strain on local facilities and transport systems	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
356	G	Prentice	GB11	Development proposals will put a strain on local facilities and transport systems	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
356	G	Prentice	GB14	Development proposals will put a strain on local facilities and transport systems	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
356	G	Prentice	GB10	Object to removal of GB at GB10, GB11 and GB14. The GB serves the purpose of maintaining a separation between the Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking; restricting urban sprawl. Proposals will have an impact on the character of the settlements and Woking as a whole.	None stated.	This representation 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 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
356	G	Prentice	GB11	Object to removal of GB at GB10, GB11 and GB14. The GB serves the purpose of maintaining a separation between the Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking; restricting urban sprawl. Proposals will have an impact on the character of the settlements and Woking as a whole.	None stated.	This representation 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 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
356	G	Prentice	GB14	Object to removal of GB at GB10, GB11 and GB14. The GB serves the purpose of maintaining a separation between the Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking; restricting urban sprawl. Proposals will have an impact on the character of the settlements and Woking as a whole.	None stated.	This representation 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 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
356	G	Prentice	GB10	The proposed densities are excessive compared with existing densities in the vicinity	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
356	G	Prentice	GB11	The proposed densities are excessive compared with existing densities in the vicinity	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
356	G	Prentice	GB14	The proposed densities are excessive compared with existing densities in the vicinity	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	There is no evidence that all existing brownfield sites have been considered and rejected	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 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	There is no evidence that all existing brownfield sites have been considered and rejected	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 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	There is no evidence that all existing brownfield sites have been considered and rejected	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 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	There is no evidence that all existing brownfield sites have been considered and rejected	Consider brownfield sites before	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the release of GB land		
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	There is no evidence that all existing brownfield sites have been considered and rejected	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 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	Current proposals to build a school and leisure centre, coupled with proposals for housing would add more traffic and exacerbate problems on the A320 and access to Worpleston railway station.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	Current proposals to build a school and leisure centre, coupled with proposals for housing would add more traffic and exacerbate problems on the A320 and access to Worpleston railway station.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	Current proposals to build a school and leisure centre, coupled with proposals for housing would add more traffic and exacerbate problems on the A320 and access to Worpleston railway station.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	Current proposals to build a school and leisure centre, coupled with proposals for housing would add more traffic and exacerbate problems on the A320 and access to Worpleston railway station.	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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	Current proposals to build a school and leisure centre, coupled with proposals for housing would add more traffic	None stated.	The proposed school application was accompanied with a Transport Assessment and Travel Plans, to assess the impact of the development on the local transport network. The County	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
				and exacerbate problems on the A320 and access to Worplesdon railway station.		Highway authority did not raise any objection to the application subject to conditions. Planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The Council 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.	of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB7	Residents have moved to Mayford for its rural and peaceful character. Object to proposals for the area	None stated.	This representation 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	Object to the release of GB land for housing. Government Guidance places high importance to the protection of GB, once established it should only be altered in "exceptional cases". National policy states that "housing need" - including for traveller sites does not justify harm to the GB.	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	Object to the release of GB land for housing. Government Guidance places high importance to the protection of GB, once established it should only be altered in "exceptional cases". National policy states that "housing need" - including for traveller sites does not justify harm to the GB.	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	Object to the release of GB land for housing. Government Guidance places high importance to the protection of GB, once established it should only be altered in "exceptional cases". National policy states that "housing need" - including for traveller sites does not justify harm to the GB.	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	Object to the release of GB land for housing. Government Guidance places high importance to the protection of GB, once established it should only be altered in "exceptional cases". National policy states that "housing need" - including for traveller sites does not justify harm to the GB.	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	Object to the release of GB land for housing. Government Guidance places high importance to the protection of GB, once established it should only be altered in "exceptional cases". National policy states that "housing need" - including for traveller sites does not justify harm to the GB.	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	Reconsider plans, the proposals would have damaging, irreversible effect on the character of the village, infrastructure, visual amenity and impact on the surrounding area. The Green Belt is precious and every effort to preserve it must be made. Once it's gone, it's gone.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 23.0 In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	Reconsider plans, the proposals would have damaging, irreversible effect on the character of the village, infrastructure, visual amenity and impact on the surrounding area. The Green Belt is precious and every effort to preserve it must be made. Once it's gone, it's gone.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 23.0 In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	Reconsider plans, the proposals would have damaging, irreversible effect on the character of the village, infrastructure, visual amenity and impact on the surrounding area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 23.0 In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				The Green Belt is precious and every effort to preserve it must be made. Once it's gone, it's gone.		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.	
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	Reconsider plans, the proposals would have damaging, irreversible effect on the character of the village, infrastructure, visual amenity and impact on the surrounding area. The Green Belt is precious and every effort to preserve it must be made. Once it's gone, it's gone.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 23.0 In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	Reconsider plans, the proposals would have damaging, irreversible effect on the character of the village, infrastructure, visual amenity and impact on the surrounding area. The Green Belt is precious and every effort to preserve it must be made. Once it's gone, it's gone.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 23.0 In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	The roads in the area are insufficient; there are single lane bridges, a tunnel under the railway and narrow roads which are often congested. The creation of suitable access from GB10,11 and 14 would be expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village	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 A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	The roads in the area are insufficient; there are single lane bridges, a tunnel under the railway and narrow roads which are often congested. The creation of suitable access from GB10,11 and 14 would be expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village	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 A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core	No further modification is 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.	
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	The roads in the area are insufficient; there are single lane bridges, a tunnel under the railway and narrow roads which are often congested. The creation of suitable access from GB10,11 and 14 would be expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	The roads in the area are insufficient; there are single lane bridges, a tunnel under the railway and narrow roads which are often congested. The creation of suitable access from GB10,11 and 14 would be expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village	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

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.	
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	The roads in the area are insufficient; there are single lane bridges, a tunnel under the railway and narrow roads which are often congested. The creation of suitable access from GB10,11 and 14 would be expensive, disruptive and would change the character of the village	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. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	No consideration has been given to flooding and surface water on the site. Saunders Lane suffers from flooding, additional housing would exacerbate problems, this has not been acknowledged	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	No consideration has been given to flooding and surface water on the site. Saunders Lane suffers from flooding, additional housing would exacerbate problems, this has not been acknowledged	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	No consideration has been given to flooding and surface water on the site. Saunders Lane suffers from flooding, additional housing would exacerbate problems, this has not been acknowledged	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	No consideration has been given to flooding and surface water on the site. Saunders Lane suffers from flooding, additional housing would exacerbate problems, this has not been acknowledged	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	No consideration has been given to flooding and surface water on the site. Saunders Lane suffers from flooding, additional housing would exacerbate problems, this has not been acknowledged	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	The proposals would remove 50% of the GB in Mayford, changing its character irreversibly.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	The proposals would remove 50% of the GB in Mayford, changing its character irreversibly.	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.</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>	
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	The proposals would remove 50% of the GB in Mayford, changing its character irreversibly.	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.</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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	The proposals would remove 50% of the GB in Mayford, changing its character irreversibly.	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.</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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	The proposals would remove 50% of the GB in Mayford, changing its character irreversibly.	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.</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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB7	Object to the increase of traveller pitches on the site. The identification of traveller sites should meet specific criteria, including access to local schools and facilities; and sites should have adequate amenity. GB7 is inappropriate, consider urban sites	GB7 is inappropriate. Consider urban sites for additional traveller pitches.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	The main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of communities. Proposals would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	The main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of communities. Proposals would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	The main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of communities. Proposals would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	The main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of communities. Proposals would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	The main purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of communities. Proposals would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI. Proposals will impact on the local wildlife and local amenity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape 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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB7	There are a number of traveller sites south of Woking, further expansion is not reasonable	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
379	Christopher	Punch	GB8	<p>There are several inaccuracies and omissions in the GBBR. Including</p> <p>(i) the land north of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and should not be considered for development.</p> <p>(ii) some land which is recommended for release from the GB contain constraints which have been ignored</p> <p>(iii) it ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document presented to Council officials in 2009.</p> <p>(iv) the ownership of land is irrelevant in determining whether it should be in or out of the Green Belt, the report only considers sites that have been put forward for development</p> <p>(v) the local transport assessment scenarios are not accurate.</p> <p>(vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford. The report only classifies it as "important", which is patently incorrect</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0, 7.0, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB9	<p>There are several inaccuracies and omissions in the GBBR. Including</p> <p>(i) the land north of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and should not be considered for development.</p> <p>(ii) some land which is recommended for release from the GB contain constraints which have been ignored</p> <p>(iii) it ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document presented to Council officials in 2009.</p> <p>(iv) the ownership of land is irrelevant in determining whether it should be in or out of the Green Belt, the report only considers sites that have been put forward for development</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0, 7.0, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				(v) the local transport assessment scenarios are not accurate. (vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford. The report only classifies it as "important", which is patently incorrect			
379	Christopher	Punch	GB10	There are several inaccuracies and omissions in the GBBR. Including (i) the land north of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"and should not be considered for development. (ii) some land which is recommended for release from the GB contain constraints which have been ignored (iii) it ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document presented to Council officials in 2009. (iv) the ownership of land is irrelevant in determining whether it should be in or out of the Green Belt, the report only considers sites that have been put forward for development (v) the local transport assessment scenarios are not accurate. (vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford. The report only classifies it as "important", which is patently incorrect	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0, 7.0, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB11	There are several inaccuracies and omissions in the GBBR. Including (i) the land north of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"and should not be considered for development. (ii) some land which is recommended for release from the GB contain constraints which have been ignored (iii) it ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document presented to Council officials in 2009. (iv) the ownership of land is irrelevant in determining whether it should be in or out of the Green Belt, the report only considers sites that have been put forward for development (v) the local transport assessment scenarios are not accurate. (vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford. The report only classifies it as "important", which is patently incorrect	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0, 7.0, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
379	Christopher	Punch	GB14	There are several inaccuracies and omissions in the GBBR. Including (i) the land north of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"and should not be considered for development. (ii) some land which is recommended for release from the GB contain constraints which have been ignored (iii) it ignores the Character Assessment of Mayford Village document presented to Council officials in 2009. (iv) the ownership of land is irrelevant in determining whether it should be in or out of the Green Belt, the report only considers sites that have been put forward for development (v) the local transport assessment scenarios are not accurate. (vi) Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford. The report only classifies it as "important", which is patently incorrect	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0, 7.0, 8.0, 12.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
379	Christopher	Punch	GB7	WBC has been inconsistent in how it has considered the GBBR in determining what sites to release from the GB for development. E.g. it accepts recommendations on Mayford sites except GB7	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
401	R	Pay	GB15	Object to GB15 and GB16. Parvis Road will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, and will have adverse impact on existing residents	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
401	R	Pay	GB16	Object to GB15 and GB16. Parvis Road will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, and will have adverse impact on existing residents	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
401	R	Pay	GB15	Health Centre/doctors are at capacity, it's difficult to get an appointment at Madera Road. When will new facilities be built to cope with more patients? Meanwhile existing residents are the ones that suffer	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
401	R	Pay	GB16	Health Centre/doctors are at capacity, it's difficult to get an appointment at Madera Road. When will new facilities be built to cope with more patients? Meanwhile existing residents are the ones that suffer	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
401	R	Pay	GB15	What happened to the rule of not building on the Green Belt?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
401	R	Pay	GB16	What happened to the rule of not building on the Green Belt?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 1.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Inappropriate Development in Green Belt - The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 (Green Belt) and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out limited circumstances where development is appropriate within the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.2 and 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Flood risk - the Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for Traveller pitches in the functional floodplain or Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The TAA states this site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for potential for expansion for additional pitches. 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, a further 15% is Flood Zone 2. This will push the site closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Special Circumstances - In the absence of Very Special Circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances' and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The previous Government (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) made this clear. The Secretary of State has re-emphasised this to local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions. Even if the Council is unable to show a five year supply of Traveller sites, this would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	None stated.	<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 4.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. 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
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character.</p> <p>With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the 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
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Additional pitches and related activities may present an increased risk to flooding as development may give rise to hard landscaping, bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, 2008). Yet the DPD states "Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site." Core Strategy (policies CS21 and CS24) and PPFTS require sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness', respect and make positively contribute to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance existing character. Business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, nuisance which is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdeshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community, further expansion is not justified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA	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	No further modification is 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, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.		<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy	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
				guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.			
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommends a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and 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
						<p>Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights 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>	
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	<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
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	<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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0	
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	Do not include this site in the DPD.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB8	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB9	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling	No further modification is 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 public transport where feasible.	
417	Kay	Philpot	GB10	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
417	Kay	Philpot	GB11	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB4	The roads in Byfleet will be gridlocked and will become unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB5	The roads in Byfleet will be gridlocked and will become unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant</p>	No further modification is 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.	
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB4	The current infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate the growth	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
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB5	The current infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate the growth	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
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB4	GB must be preserved. Other land is available	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB5	GB must be preserved. Other land is available	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB4	Historic flooding issues in Byfleet	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
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB5	Historic flooding issues in Byfleet	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
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB4	The petition signed by Byfleet residents has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB5	The petition signed by Byfleet residents has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB4	The proposal would remove most of the GB in Byfleet and leave the rest of GB in Woking preserved.	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
430	Kevin	Parslow	GB5	The proposal would remove most of the GB in Byfleet and leave the rest of GB in Woking preserved.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
433	David	Peattie	GB7	Ten Acre is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI, additional expansion would have further impact on the wildlife in the area.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide 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
433	David	Peattie	GB7	The GB in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals in Mayford could increase the risk of coalescence between the areas. There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	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
433	David	Peattie	GB8	The GB in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals in Mayford could increase the risk of coalescence between the areas. There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	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
433	David	Peattie	GB9	The GB in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals in Mayford could increase the risk of coalescence between the areas. There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	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
433	David	Peattie	GB10	The GB in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals in Mayford could increase the risk of coalescence between the areas. There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	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
433	David	Peattie	GB11	The GB in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals in Mayford could increase the risk of coalescence between the areas. There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	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
433	David	Peattie	GB14	The GB in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals in Mayford could increase the risk of coalescence between the areas. There appears to be no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement.	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
433	David	Peattie	GB7	Object to proposals in Mayford. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council. The Council is proposing changes to the GB based on the	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				GBBR report. It is considered that the methodology of the GBBR is flawed		followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	
433	David	Peattie	GB8	Object to proposals in Mayford. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council. The Council is proposing changes to the GB based on the GBBR report. It is considered that the methodology of the GBBR is flawed	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB9	Object to proposals in Mayford. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council. The Council is proposing changes to the GB based on the GBBR report. It is considered that the methodology of the GBBR is flawed	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB10	Object to proposals in Mayford. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council. The Council is proposing changes to the GB based on the GBBR report. It is considered that the methodology of the GBBR is flawed	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB11	Object to proposals in Mayford. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council. The Council is proposing changes to the GB based on the GBBR report. It is considered that the methodology of the GBBR is flawed	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB14	Object to proposals in Mayford. Central Government issued guidance in October 2014 to protect the GB has been ignored by the Council. The Council is proposing changes to the GB based on the GBBR report. It is considered that the methodology of the GBBR is flawed	None stated.	The Council is aware of the Ministerial Statement and has assessed the implications of this statement and the updated guidance for its plan-making process. A note of the Council's assessment is available on the Woking Borough Council website. The note concluded that there is nothing in the statement or the updated NPPG to change national policy which is followed in the Core Strategy or to indicate any change in the approach adopted towards the preparation of the Delivery DPD Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 8.0, 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB8	Wildlife in the area will be wiped out due to the proximity of sites to protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0 In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
433	David	Peattie	GB9	Wildlife in the area will be wiped out due to the proximity of sites to protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is 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, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB10	Wildlife in the area will be wiped out due to the proximity of sites to protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB11	Wildlife in the area will be wiped out due to the proximity of sites to protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB14	Wildlife in the area will be wiped out due to the proximity of sites to protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the</p>	No further modification is 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. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.	
433	David	Peattie	GB7	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
433	David	Peattie	GB7	Object to GB7. Traveller sites are focused in this part of the Borough. Mayford already makes a major contribution towards the traveller community. There is no justification for 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
433	David	Peattie	GB10	The NPPF states that GB boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, this has not been demonstrated. Policy clearly states that housing need- including traveller sites- does not justify harm to GB. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted all brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB7	The NPPF states that GB boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, this has not been demonstrated. Policy clearly states that housing need- including traveller sites- does not justify harm to GB. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted all brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB8	The NPPF states that GB boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, this has not been demonstrated. Policy clearly states that housing need- including traveller sites- does not justify harm to GB. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted all brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB9	The NPPF states that GB boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, this has not been demonstrated. Policy clearly states that housing need- including traveller sites- does not justify harm to GB. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted all brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB11	The NPPF states that GB boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, this has not been demonstrated. Policy clearly states that housing need- including traveller sites- does not justify harm to GB. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted all brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
433	David	Peattie	GB14	The NPPF states that GB boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, this has not been demonstrated. Policy clearly states that housing need- including traveller sites- does not justify harm to GB. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate WBC has exhausted brownfield sites	Provide evidence to demonstrate that WBC has exhausted all brownfield sites first	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4. and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
433	David	Peattie	GB7	The GBBR dismissed consideration of GB purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' because Woking was not considered to have a particularly strong historic character. However Mayford has a unique character 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. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB8	The GBBR dismissed consideration of GB purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' because Woking was not considered to have a particularly strong historic character. However Mayford has a unique character 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. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB9	The GBBR dismissed consideration of GB purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' because Woking was not considered to have a particularly strong historic character. However Mayford has a unique character 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. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB10	The GBBR dismissed consideration of GB purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' because Woking was not considered to have a particularly strong historic character. However Mayford has a unique character 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. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB11	The GBBR dismissed consideration of GB purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' because Woking was not considered to have a particularly strong historic character. However Mayford has a unique character 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. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
433	David	Peattie	GB14	The GBBR dismissed consideration of GB purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' because Woking was not considered to have a particularly strong historic character. However Mayford has a unique character 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. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB8	No consideration has been given to the impact on infrastructure as a result of the proposals. In particular, additional housing will put a strain on roads and transport infrastructure. Including Egley Road and Prey Heath Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The 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
433	David	Peattie	GB9	No consideration has been given to the impact on infrastructure as a result of the proposals. In particular, additional housing will put a strain on roads and transport infrastructure. Including Egley Road and Prey Heath Road.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB10	No consideration has been given to the impact on infrastructure as a result of the proposals. In particular, additional housing will put a strain on roads and transport infrastructure. Including Egley Road and Prey Heath Road.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB11	No consideration has been given to the impact on infrastructure as a result of the proposals. In particular, additional housing will put a strain on roads and transport infrastructure. Including Egley Road and Prey Heath Road.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. 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
433	David	Peattie	GB14	No consideration has been given to the impact on infrastructure as a result of the proposals. In particular, additional housing will put a strain on roads and transport infrastructure. Including Egley Road and Prey Heath Road.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
433	David	Peattie	GB7	Land availability makes a site more viable than other GB land removing GB land. Ownership should not have any bearing on whether a site remains in the GB 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
433	David	Peattie	GB8	Land availability makes a site more viable than other GB land removing GB land. Ownership should not have any bearing on whether a site remains in the GB 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
433	David	Peattie	GB9	Land availability makes a site more viable than other GB land removing GB land. Ownership should not have any bearing on whether a site remains in the GB 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
433	David	Peattie	GB10	Land availability makes a site more viable than other GB land removing GB land. Ownership should not have any bearing on whether a site remains in the GB 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
433	David	Peattie	GB11	Land availability makes a site more viable than other GB land removing GB land. Ownership should not have any bearing on whether a site remains in the GB 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
433	David	Peattie	GB14	Land availability makes a site more viable than other GB land removing GB land. Ownership should not have any bearing on whether a site remains in the GB 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
434	Allison	Parslow	GB4	Roads in Byfleet are often gridlocked and will become unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB5	Roads in Byfleet are often gridlocked and will become unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in</p>	No further modification is 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>	
434	Allison	Parslow	GB15	Roads in Byfleet are often gridlocked and will become unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB16	Roads in Byfleet are often gridlocked and will become unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate</p>	No further modification is 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.	
434	Allison	Parslow	GB4	The infrastructure in the area is inadequate and will need rectifying before any development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB5	The infrastructure in the area is inadequate and will need rectifying before any development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB15	The infrastructure in the area is inadequate and will need rectifying before any development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB16	The infrastructure in the area is inadequate and will need rectifying before any development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB4	Preserve the GB, consider other available land	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB5	Preserve the GB, consider other available land	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB15	Preserve the GB, consider other available land	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB16	Preserve the GB, consider other available land	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB4	Byfleet is vulnerable to 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
434	Allison	Parslow	GB5	Byfleet is vulnerable to 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
434	Allison	Parslow	GB15	Byfleet is vulnerable to 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
434	Allison	Parslow	GB16	Byfleet is vulnerable to 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
434	Allison	Parslow	GB4	The petition signed by Byfleet residents has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB5	The petition signed by Byfleet residents has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB15	The petition signed by Byfleet residents has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of	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
						countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB16	The petition signed by Byfleet residents has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB4	Most of the GB in Byfleet will be lost at the expense of GB in the rest of Woking. This is disproportional.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt and are in sustainable locations including good access to local services and infrastructure. In addition, proposals will be required to make contributions towards strategic infrastructure or in some cases provide on-site infrastructure where relevant. Infrastructure provision is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB5	Most of the GB in Byfleet will be lost at the expense of GB in the rest of Woking. This is disproportional.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
434	Allison	Parslow	GB15	Most of the GB in Byfleet will be lost at the expense of GB in the rest of Woking. This is disproportional.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
434	Allison	Parslow	GB16	Most of the GB in Byfleet will be lost at the expense of GB in the rest of Woking. This is disproportional.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Inappropriate Development in Green Belt - The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 (Green Belt) and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out limited circumstances where development is appropriate within the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.2 and 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Flood risk - the Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for Traveller pitches in the functional floodplain or Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The TAA states this site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for potential for expansion for additional pitches. 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, a further 15% is Flood Zone 2. This will push the site closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				scene or character of the area.		sustainable.	
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Special Circumstances - In the absence of Very Special Circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances' and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The previous Government (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) made this clear. The Secretary of State has re-emphasised this to local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions. Even if the Council is unable to show a five year supply of Traveller sites, this would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.	None stated.	The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents. The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.			
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	None stated.	The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site 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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Additional pitches and related activities may present an increased risk to flooding as development may give rise to hard landscaping, bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, 2008). Yet the DPD states "Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site." Core Strategy (policies CS21 and CS24) and PPFTS require sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness', respect and make positively contribute to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance existing character. Business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, nuisance which is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community, further expansion is not justified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA	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	No further modification is 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, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.		<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm	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
				done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.			
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommends a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the 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 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
				due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.		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	of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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	
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation 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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation 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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation 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
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is 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 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.	
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	Do not include this site in the DPD.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB8	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
439	Andre	Philpot	GB9	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB10	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
439	Andre	Philpot	GB11	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Inappropriate Development in Green Belt - The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 (Green Belt) and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out limited circumstances where development is appropriate within the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.2 and 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Flood risk - the Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for Traveller pitches in the functional floodplain or Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The TAA states this site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for potential for expansion for additional pitches. 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, a further 15% is Flood Zone 2. This will push the site closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Special Circumstances - In the absence of Very Special Circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances' and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The previous Government (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) made this clear. The Secretary of State has re-emphasised this to local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions. Even if the Council is unable to show a five year supply of Traveller sites, this would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	None stated.	<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 4.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. 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
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character.</p> <p>With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the 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
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Additional pitches and related activities may present an increased risk to flooding as development may give rise to hard landscaping, bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, 2008). Yet the DPD states "Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site." Core Strategy (policies CS21 and CS24) and PPFTS require sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness', respect and make positively contribute to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance existing character. Business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, nuisance which is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchingtan, Burdeshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community, further expansion is not justified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA	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	No further modification is 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, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.		<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm	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
				done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.			
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommends a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the 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 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
				due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.		<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
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	<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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	Do not include this site in the DPD.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB8	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB9	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB10	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
440	Daniel	Philpot	GB11	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking and Guildford, with only 2 miles between Mayford roundabout and Slyfield. Development would result in the high risk of coalescence between the two towns	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Inappropriate Development in Green Belt - The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6 (Green Belt) and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which set out limited circumstances where development is appropriate within the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0, particularly paragraph 4.2 and 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Flood risk - the Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for Traveller pitches in the functional floodplain or Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The TAA states this site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for potential for expansion for additional pitches. 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, a further 15% is Flood Zone 2. This will push the site closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Accessibility - Core Strategy and SHLAA state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities. The SHLAA states Ten Acre Farm has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average." In reality Mayford has no supporting infrastructure (shops, doctors, dentists, schools, employment opportunities) and poor public transport system (infrequent limited bus services, residents are isolated without a vehicle). For isolated sites, a communal building is also recommended (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites). If located at the front of the site as recommended this WILL NOT positively enhance the environment or increase its openness, respect the street scene or character of the area.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Infrastructure, services and cost - allocated sites must be deliverable (including affordable to intended occupiers) so needs are met. Policy CS14 states "the site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed". There is little existing infrastructure at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, driveway that does not meet emergency vehicle requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and minimal connection to water and electricity services. It is adjacent to the main railway line, requiring significant acoustic barriers and would have to be raised clear of flood risk at great cost.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Special Circumstances - In the absence of Very Special Circumstances justifying an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances' and is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The previous Government (Brandon Lewis MP Statements) made this clear. The Secretary of State has re-emphasised this to local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions. Even if the Council is unable to show a five year supply of Traveller sites, this would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.	None stated.	<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 4.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. 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
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment - Core Strategy Policy CS14 states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment". Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPFTS) requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated'. Policy CS24 requires any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road, including two 16th Century Grade II listed buildings close to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside. This private Traveller site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (PLAN/1987/0282). It was never envisaged that this would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family, who have lived on site and in Smarts Heath Road for many years. Additional pitches will comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance, currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites'. Up to twelve pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standing for a large trailer and touring caravan and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment and WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene." This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominating the settled community and reducing the amenity value, contrary to Policies CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With respect to reference to heritage assets, see Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character.</p> <p>With respect to the representation regarding the identification of the site to meet future Traveller needs. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries to Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), B380 road, 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated by Bird Life International as an "Important Bird Area". The Hoe Stream is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley. Extending this site WOULD adversely impact these sensitive sites.	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the 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
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Additional pitches and related activities may present an increased risk to flooding as development may give rise to hard landscaping, bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Business Use - Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential, those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, 2008). Yet the DPD states "Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site." Core Strategy (policies CS21 and CS24) and PPFTS require sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness', respect and make positively contribute to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance existing character. Business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, nuisance which is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary in Mayford will weaken the boundary, due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	IMPACT - Site Concentration. ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchingtan, Burdeshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community, further expansion is not justified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Concerned that various development proposals in Guildford (e.g. football club, development on Slyfield Industrial Estate) will have an impact on Woking residents and concerned that residents, specifically in Mayford have not been consulted. Development likely to cause gridlock on the A320	None stated.	Whilst the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and 20.0. See also Section 3.0 and paragraph 1.5 The Council has worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA	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	No further modification is 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, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.		<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper deals with instances where site based Flood Risk Assessment is required. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the Site Allocations DPD. GB8 is in Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged. GB8 also has the provision of SU as a key requirement, which will help address the concerns made by the representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy	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
				guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.			
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, as outlined in National Policy. This has not been proved by the Council, particularly regrading policy guidance stating that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	No independently verified evidence demonstrates the Council have exhausted brownfield sites for development in its plan	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	SITE IS NOT SUITABLE - SHLAA noted a number of physical and environmental problems with this site: 1. Contaminated Land - in the GBR sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a Traveller site due to concerns over land contamination. Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites says sites must not be located on contaminated land. Land must be decontaminated by approved contractors to ensure housing development could take place. This can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where financially viable from the outset. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable for expansion for this reason.	None stated.	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommends a priority order. The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states "the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches". The DPD uses the term from the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TAA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal. It was never envisaged that this Traveller site would be expanded outside the occupier's immediate family. The Council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and 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
						<p>Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights 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>	
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Raises the issue that residential development on Egley Road will hinder the Green Belt Review's finding that a school would maintain openness of the area	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0	
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10 Acre Farm as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB7	Object to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches as the site not currently deliverable. If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 - GBR). Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD. The owner/occupier continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use. The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. The site should not be included in the DPD.	Do not include this site in the DPD.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	Woking Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be designated as Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB8	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB9	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling	No further modification is 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 public transport where feasible.	
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB10	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
441	Christopher	Philpot	GB11	There is a lack of safe and easy access by foot around the Mayford and particularly to Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
468	Graham	Pereira	GB12	I will continue to rise against the Council's proposals to remove Green Belt and will gather support to stop the plans.	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
468	Graham	Pereira	GB13	I will continue to rise against the Council's proposals to remove Green Belt and will gather support to stop the plans.	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
468	Graham	Pereira	GB12	Objects to the Council's plans and proposals to use precious Green Belt land for housing development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
468	Graham	Pereira	GB13	Objects to the Council's plans and proposals to use precious Green Belt land for housing development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
468	Graham	Pereira	GB12	The fields form a large part of Pyrford's Green Belt and their location is a gateway to our lovely village. Another 400+ houses would take away the name Village.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure 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
468	Graham	Pereira	GB13	The fields form a large part of Pyrford's Green Belt and their location is a gateway to our lovely village. Another 400+ houses would take away the name Village.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure 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
468	Graham	Pereira	GB12	Social, community and transport infrastructure is not adequate, specifically regarding schools, doctors surgeries and traffic on local roads. The increased use of the roads by cyclists at weekends is making driving dangerous.	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
468	Graham	Pereira	GB13	Social, community and transport infrastructure is not adequate, specifically regarding schools, doctors surgeries and traffic using local roads as cut throughs. The increased use of the roads by cyclists at weekends is making driving dangerous.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In terms of the point on the doctors surgery, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB10	Objects to potential for urban sprawl to the south of Hook Heath, which would result in the merging of it with Mayford and loss of even more Green Belt land.	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
486	D	Pullen	GB11	Objects to potential for urban sprawl to the south of Hook Heath, which would result in the merging of it with Mayford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 12.0, and for justification for the release of Green Belt land, as background to the Council's approach, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and loss of even more Green Belt land.			of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB14	Objects to potential for urban sprawl to the south of Hook Heath, which would result in the merging of it with Mayford and loss of even more Green Belt land.	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
486	D	Pullen	GB10	Woking Council is ignoring government guidance issued in 2014 on protecting Green Belt land. Only in exceptional circumstances should their recommendations be ignored, and in view of there still being plenty of brownfield sites, these are not exceptional times.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB11	Woking Council is ignoring government guidance issued in 2014 on protecting Green Belt land. Only in exceptional circumstances should their recommendations be ignored, and in view of there still being plenty of brownfield sites, these are not exceptional times.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB14	Woking Council is ignoring government guidance issued in 2014 on protecting Green Belt land. Only in exceptional circumstances should their recommendations be ignored, and in view of there still being plenty of brownfield sites, these are not exceptional times.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB10	The proposed density is six times the present level! Please do not ignore our views.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB11	The proposed density is six times the present level! Please do not ignore our views.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB14	The proposed density is six times the present level! Please do not ignore our views.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB10	Objects to the proposed developments as a further increase in density of the existing population will mean that infrastructure unable to cope with present numbers would be unmanageable. We are already bulging at the seams!	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB11	Objects to the proposed developments as a further increase in density of the existing population will mean that infrastructure unable to cope with present numbers would be unmanageable. We are already bulging at the seams! This is particularly the case with traffic at busy times on Egley Road, overflowing doctors and dentists and car parking that is already full in the station area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
486	D	Pullen	GB14	Objects to the proposed developments as a further increase in density of the existing population will mean that infrastructure unable to cope with present numbers would be unmanageable. We are already bulging at the seams! This is particularly the case with traffic at busy times on Egley Road, overflowing doctors and dentists and car parking that is already full in the station area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
500	David	Pope	GB15	Why do we have to lose most of our Green Belt. West Byfleet is meant to be a village - with this encroachment we will lose our identity.	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The Council has robust policies in place that will make sure that future development is of high quality and reflects local character. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21 and the Design	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						SPD.	
500	David	Pope	GB16	Why do we have to lose most of our Green Belt. West Byfleet is meant to be a village - with this encroachment we will lose our identity.	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 Council has robust policies in place that will make sure that future development is of high quality and reflects local character. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21 and the Design SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
500	David	Pope	GB15	Schools are already full and having to extend, and the Health Centre is understaffed and difficult to get an appointment. There is a poor selection of shops in West Byfleet which will not cope with extra people's demands.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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. With regard to local shopping provision, there are two sites allocated within this DPD in West Byfleet (UA50 Car park to east of Enterprise House, Station Approach and UA51 Land at Station Approach, including Waitrose) that include retail development, and it is expected that these sites have the capacity respond to an increasing demand for shops. However it should be noted that keeping shelves stacked within shops is an operational issue for retailers, rather than a planning issue.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
500	David	Pope	GB16	Schools are already full and having to extend, and the Health Centre is understaffed and difficult to get an appointment. There is a poor selection of shops in West Byfleet which will not cope with extra people's demands.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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. With regard to local shopping provision, there are two sites allocated within this DPD in West Byfleet (UA50 Car park to east of Enterprise House, Station Approach and UA51 Land at Station Approach, including Waitrose) that include retail development, and it is expected that these sites have the capacity respond to an increasing demand for shops. However it should be noted that keeping shelves stacked within shops is an operational issue for retailers, rather than a planning issue.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
500	David	Pope	GB15	Very concerned about impacts on road infrastructure and traffic in West Byfleet, Parvis Road is already full to capacity and Dartnell Park exits near Broadoaks are a real concern.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
500	David	Pope	GB16	Very concerned about impacts on road infrastructure and traffic in West Byfleet, Parvis Road is already full to capacity and Dartnell Park exits near Broadoaks are a real concern.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	The Site Allocations document does not reflect the recommendations of the Council's Green Belt Review. This designates these sites as 'Fundamental to the Green Belt' or 'Retain in the Green Belt' which has been ignored by the Council. No justification has been provided not to adhere to the Green Belt Review recommendations. Therefore this is not a reasonable basis on which to proceed.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively 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
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	The Site Allocations document does not reflect the recommendations of the Council's Green Belt Review. This designates these sites as 'Fundamental to the Green Belt' or 'Retain in the Green Belt' which has been ignored by the Council. No justification has been provided not to adhere to the Green Belt Review recommendations. Therefore this is not a reasonable basis on which to proceed.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	There has been a substantial increase in traffic over the last 15 years due to the increased population in Woking. Major development has transformed the town from a semi rural Surrey town to a densely developed area blighted by ugly high rise buildings. High traffic volumes have led to serious safety concerns and accidents, and the increased traffic volume from development will exacerbate the already dangerous road safety position.	None stated.	This representation 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
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	There has been a substantial increase in traffic over the last 15 years due to the increased population in Woking. Major development has transformed the town from a semi rural Surrey town to a densely developed area blighted by ugly high rise buildings. High traffic volumes have led to serious safety concerns and accidents, and the increased traffic volume from development will exacerbate the already dangerous road safety position.	None stated.	This representation 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
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	Central government policy is to use all available brownfield land for development, which WBC should prioritise to satisfy housing targets, rather than land in continuous agricultural use.	Remove site GB12 from the site allocation proposal.	<p>The Council has considered a number of sites within the existing urban area for development needs. This is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. It should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the urban area to meet some of the existing development needs. The proposed allocation of the sites in Pyrford are for development needs between 2027 and 2040 and by 'safeguarding' land in this way, the Council believes its approach is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposed modification. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.14.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	Central government policy is to use all available brownfield land for development, which WBC should prioritise to satisfy housing targets, rather than land in continuous agricultural use.	Remove site GB13 from the site allocation proposal.	<p>The Council has considered a number of sites within the existing urban area for development needs. This is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. It should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the urban area to meet some of the existing development needs. The proposed allocation of the sites in Pyrford are for development needs between 2027 and 2040 and by 'safeguarding' land in this way, the Council believes its approach is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposed modification. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.14.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	Development at these sites can not be justified as WBC have not prioritised development of brownfield sites, including: the derelict site at the corner of Victoria Way and Church Street; Sheer House in West Byfleet, where previous planning applications have been refused, and the office block known as Apex Court in Camphill Road, West Byfleet. These sites should be prioritised for residential development.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the existing urban area that will meet some of the Borough's development needs over the Plan period. Nevertheless the Council has recognised that Green Belt land will need to be identified for development needs post 2022. The Council's Issues and Matters Paper sets out the Council's assessment of brownfield sites across the Borough. See Section 11.0 as well as the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The site on Victoria Way (UA13) is allocated for employment purposes, i.e. office development. It should be clearly set out that the Council and in particular the Core Strategy seeks to enable a buoyant local economy with good quality offices which will meet the needs of modern businesses. This will mainly be encouraged in Woking Town Centre as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. This site will provide a significant contribution towards the economic strategy of the Borough.</p> <p>Sheer House (Site UA51) is proposed to be allocated for a mixed use development including residential, retail and office accommodation. This site plays a key role in the economic vibrancy and viability of West Byfleet District Centre. Therefore the Council believe that a solely residential development will not be beneficial to West Byfleet as would significantly reduce the amount of retail, office and community facilities 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
						<p>Apex Court on Camphill Road has outstanding permitted development permission for the change of use from office to residential (16 flats). This site is therefore considered to be suitable for residential purposes and meets the threshold to be included in the Site Allocations. However the site is located within an Employment Zone where the Council will seek to protect employment uses where possible. Therefore the site will not included within the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that there is still a requirement to identify land within the Green Belt to meet future development needs.</p>	
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	Development at these sites can not be justified as WBC have not prioritised development of brownfield sites, including: the derelict site at the corner of Victoria Way and Church Street; Sheer House in West Byfleet, where previous planning applications have been refused, and the office block known as Apex Court in Camphill Road, West Byfleet. These sites should be prioritised for residential development.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the existing urban area that will meet some of the Borough's development needs over the Plan period. Nevertheless the Council has recognised that Green Belt land will need to be identified for development needs post 2022. The Council's Issues and Matters Paper sets out the Council's assessment of brownfield sites across the Borough. See Section 11.0 as well as the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The site on Victoria Way (UA13) is allocated for employment purposes, i.e. office development. It should be clearly set out that the Council and in particular the Core Strategy seeks to enable a buoyant local economy with good quality offices which will meet the needs of modern businesses. This will mainly be encouraged in Woking Town Centre as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. This site will provide a significant contribution towards the economic strategy of the Borough.</p> <p>Sheer House (Site UA51) is proposed to be allocated for a mixed use development including residential, retail and office accommodation. This site plays a key role in the economic vibrancy and viability of West Byfleet District Centre. Therefore the Council believe that a solely residential development will not be beneficial to West Byfleet as would significantly reduce the amount of retail, office and community facilities in the area.</p> <p>Apex Court on Camphill Road has outstanding permitted development permission for the change of use from office to residential (16 flats). This site is therefore considered to be suitable for residential purposes and meets the threshold to be included in the Site Allocations. However the site is located within an Employment Zone where the Council will seek to protect employment uses where possible. Therefore the site will not included within the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that there is still a requirement to identify land within the Green Belt to meet future development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	WBC's current proposals do not reflect the Conservative Party 2015 Election manifesto commitments on the Green Belt, which protect it and ensuring use of brownfield land for development.	None stated.	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out national Green Belt policy. Since its implementation, there has been no change of national policy of material significance. The Core Strategy sets out that between 2022 and 2027, land will need to be identified in the Green Belt to meet the development needs of the Borough. This was agreed by the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and is therefore preparing the Site Allocations DPD to identify and bring forward sites to deliver it. More information on this is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that it's approach is consistent with the NPPF and will enable the delivery of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	WBC's current proposals do not reflect the Conservative Party 2015 Election manifesto commitments on the Green Belt, which protect it and ensuring use of brownfield land for development.	None stated.	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out national Green Belt policy. Since its implementation, there has been no change of national policy of material significance. The Core Strategy sets out that between 2022 and 2027, land will need to be identified in the Green Belt to meet the development needs of the Borough. This was agreed by the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and is therefore preparing the Site Allocations DPD to identify and bring forward sites to deliver it. More information on this is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that it's approach is consistent with the NPPF and will enable the delivery of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	It will not be possible to build affordable housing at densities which compliment adjoining areas.	None stated.	<p>There appears to be no evidence to back this statement, and it would be premature to assume this before a development proposal comes forward. Affordable housing should be provided as part of a mixed and sensitively designed development, in line with the allocation's key requirements and Core Strategy (particularly CS11, CS12 and CS21) and Development Plan policies.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	It will not be possible to build affordable housing at densities which compliment adjoining areas.	None stated.	<p>There appears to be no evidence to back this statement, and it would be premature to assume this before a development proposal comes forward. Affordable housing should be provided as part of a mixed and sensitively designed development, in line with the allocation's key</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						requirements and Core Strategy (particularly CS11, CS12 and CS21) and Development Plan policies.	of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	WBC should identify and encourage development of small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets. This would avoid need for large scale development which has major impacts on local communities, whilst preserving character of individual villages.	Identify small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets, and avoid large scale development.	<p>The Council has considered a significant number of sites across the Borough to meet its housing requirements. This includes both sites in the existing urban area and alternative sites in the Green Belt. Based on the existing evidence, the proposed sites are considered to be the most suitable and sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives. This has been addressed in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and 11.0.</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
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	WBC should identify and encourage development of small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets. This would avoid need for large scale development which has major impacts on local communities, whilst preserving character of individual villages.	Identify small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets, and avoid large scale development.	<p>The Council has considered a significant number of sites across the Borough to meet its housing requirements. This includes both sites in the existing urban area and alternative sites in the Green Belt. Based on the existing evidence, the proposed sites are considered to be the most suitable and sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives. This has been addressed in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and 11.0.</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
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	Pyrford is a vibrant community and place to live. Many residents have family roots here or have more here because of the delightful character of the village and it's semi-rural setting. Development will destroy this environment and irrevocably change the character of the village. A massive new housing scheme will not blend in with existing houses and create a blot on the landscape.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	Pyrford is a vibrant community and place to live. Many residents have family roots here or have more here because of the delightful character of the village and it's semi-rural setting. Development will destroy this environment and irrevocably change the character of the village. A massive new housing scheme will not blend in with existing houses and create a blot on the landscape.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	Distributing development on smaller sites around the Borough would also spread the consequential demands for infrastructure (schools, health, utilities and public transport) and avoid large increases in traffic with associated cost and disruption of highways improvements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. 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
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	Distributing development on smaller sites around the Borough would also spread the consequential demands for infrastructure (schools, health, utilities and public transport) and avoid large increases in traffic with associated cost and disruption of highways improvements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. 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
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB12	The Council has not made the case to justify the allocation of these sites for development. Urges the Council to think	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land in the Green Belt for development post 2027 has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	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
				again, or risk losing support of a large section of the local community.		See Section 1.0 and 2.0. By assessing a wide range of evidence, as set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD, the Council considers the site to be suitable for residential development. 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.	of this representation
515	Malcolm	Pritchard	GB13	The Council has not made the case to justify the allocation of these sites for development. Urges the Council to think again, or risk losing support of a large section of the local community.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land in the Green Belt for development post 2027 has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. By assessing a wide range of evidence, as set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD, the Council considers the site to be suitable for residential development. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	The Site Allocations document does not reflect the recommendations of the Council's Green Belt Review. This designates these sites as 'Fundamental to the Green Belt' or 'Retain in the Green Belt' which has been ignored by the Council. No justification has been provided not to adhere to the Green Belt Review recommendations. Therefore this is not a reasonable basis on which to proceed.	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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	The Site Allocations document does not reflect the recommendations of the Council's Green Belt Review. This designates these sites as 'Fundamental to the Green Belt' or 'Retain in the Green Belt' which has been ignored by the Council. No justification has been provided not to adhere to the Green Belt Review recommendations. Therefore this is not a reasonable basis on which to proceed.	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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	There has been a substantial increase in traffic over the last 15 years due to the increased population in Woking. Major development has transformed the town from a semi rural Surrey town to a densely developed area blighted by ugly high rise buildings. High traffic volumes have led to serious safety concerns and accidents, and the increased traffic volume from development will exacerbate the already dangerous road safety position.	None stated.	This representation 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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	There has been a substantial increase in traffic over the last 15 years due to the increased population in Woking. Major development has transformed the town from a semi rural Surrey town to a densely developed area blighted by ugly high rise buildings. High traffic volumes have led to serious safety concerns and accidents, and the increased traffic volume from development will exacerbate the already dangerous road safety position.	None stated.	This representation 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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	Central government policy is to use all available brownfield land for development, which WBC should prioritise to satisfy housing targets, rather than land in continuous agricultural use.	Remove site GB12 from the site allocation proposal.	The Council has considered a number of sites within the existing urban area for development needs. This is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. It should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the urban area to meet some of the existing development needs. The proposed allocation of the sites in Pyrford are for development needs between 2027 and 2040 and by 'safeguarding' land in this way, the Council believes its approach is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality. The Council notes the proposed modification. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.14.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	Central government policy is to use all available brownfield land for development, which WBC should prioritise to satisfy housing targets, rather than land in continuous agricultural use.	Remove site GB13 from the site allocation proposal.	<p>The Council has considered a number of sites within the existing urban area for development needs. This is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0. It should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the urban area to meet some of the existing development needs. The proposed allocation of the sites in Pyrford are for development needs between 2027 and 2040 and by 'safeguarding' land in this way, the Council believes its approach is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA. Whilst it is agreed that agricultural land is important for sustainable food production, it should be noted that this particular site is of low soil quality.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposed modification. This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.14.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	Development at these sites can not be justified as WBC have not prioritised development of brownfield sites, including: the derelict site at the corner of Victoria Way and Church Street; Sheer House in West Byfleet, where previous planning applications have been refused, and the office block known as Apex Court in Camphill Road, West Byfleet. These sites should be prioritised for residential development.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the existing urban area that will meet some of the Borough's development needs over the Plan period. Nevertheless the Council has recognised that Green Belt land will need to be identified for development needs post 2022. The Council's Issues and Matters Paper sets out the Council's assessment of brownfield sites across the Borough. See Section 11.0 as well as the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The site on Victoria Way (UA13) is allocated for employment purposes, i.e. office development. It should be clearly set out that the Council and in particular the Core Strategy seeks to enable a buoyant local economy with good quality offices which will meet the needs of modern businesses. This will mainly be encouraged in Woking Town Centre as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. This site will provide a significant contribution towards the economic strategy of the Borough.</p> <p>Sheer House (Site UA51) is proposed to be allocated for a mixed use development including residential, retail and office accommodation. This site plays a key role in the economic vibrancy and viability of West Byfleet District Centre. Therefore the Council believe that a solely residential development will not be beneficial to West Byfleet as would significantly reduce the amount of retail, office and community facilities in the area.</p> <p>Apex Court on Camphill Road has outstanding permitted development permission for the change of use from office to residential (16 flats). This site is therefore considered to be suitable for residential purposes and meets the threshold to be included in the Site Allocations. However the site is located within an Employment Zone where the Council will seek to protect employment uses where possible. Therefore the site will not included within the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that there is still a requirement to identify land within the Green Belt to meet future development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	Development at these sites can not be justified as WBC have not prioritised development of brownfield sites, including: the derelict site at the corner of Victoria Way and Church Street; Sheer House in West Byfleet, where previous planning applications have been refused, and the office block known as Apex Court in Camphill Road, West Byfleet. These sites should be prioritised for residential development.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the existing urban area that will meet some of the Borough's development needs over the Plan period. Nevertheless the Council has recognised that Green Belt land will need to be identified for development needs post 2022. The Council's Issues and Matters Paper sets out the Council's assessment of brownfield sites across the Borough. See Section 11.0 as well as the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The site on Victoria Way (UA13) is allocated for employment purposes, i.e. office development. It should be clearly set out that the Council and in particular the Core Strategy seeks to enable a buoyant local economy with good quality offices which will meet the needs of modern businesses. This will mainly be encouraged in Woking Town Centre as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. This site will provide a significant contribution towards the economic strategy of the Borough.</p> <p>Sheer House (Site UA51) is proposed to be allocated for a mixed use development including residential, retail and office accommodation. This site plays a key role in the economic vibrancy and viability of West Byfleet District Centre. Therefore the Council believe that a solely residential development will not be beneficial to West Byfleet as would significantly reduce the amount of retail, office and community facilities in the area.</p> <p>Apex Court on Camphill Road has outstanding permitted development permission for the change of use from office to residential (16 flats). This site is therefore considered to be suitable for residential purposes and meets the threshold to be included in the Site Allocations. However the site is located within an Employment Zone where the Council will seek to protect employment uses where possible. Therefore the site will not included within the Site</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that there is still a requirement to identify land within the Green Belt to meet future development needs.</p>	
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	WBC's current proposals do not reflect the Conservative Party 2015 Election manifesto commitments on the Green Belt, which protect it and ensuring use of brownfield land for development.	None stated.	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out national Green Belt policy. Since its implementation, there has been no change of national policy of material significance. The Core Strategy sets out that between 2022 and 2027, land will need to be identified in the Green Belt to meet the development needs of the Borough. This was agreed by the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and is therefore preparing the Site Allocations DPD to identify and bring forward sites to deliver it. More information on this is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that it's approach is consistent with the NPPF and will enable the delivery of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	WBC's current proposals do not reflect the Conservative Party 2015 Election manifesto commitments on the Green Belt, which protect it and ensuring use of brownfield land for development.	None stated.	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out national Green Belt policy. Since its implementation, there has been no change of national policy of material significance. The Core Strategy sets out that between 2022 and 2027, land will need to be identified in the Green Belt to meet the development needs of the Borough. This was agreed by the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and is therefore preparing the Site Allocations DPD to identify and bring forward sites to deliver it. More information on this is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>Overall, the Council believes that it's approach is consistent with the NPPF and will enable the delivery of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	It will not be possible to build affordable housing at densities which compliment adjoining areas.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	It will not be possible to build affordable housing at densities which compliment adjoining areas.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	WBC should identify and encourage development of small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets. This would avoid need for large scale development which has major impacts on local communities, whilst preserving character of individual villages.	Identify small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets, and avoid large scale development.	<p>The Council has considered a significant number of sites across the Borough to meet its housing requirements. This includes both sites in the existing urban area and alternative sites in the Green Belt. Based on the existing evidence, the proposed sites are considered to be the most suitable and sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives. This has been addressed in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and 11.0.</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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	WBC should identify and encourage development of small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets. This would avoid need for large scale development which has major impacts on local communities, whilst preserving character of individual villages.	Identify small sites around the Borough to deliver housing targets, and avoid large scale development.	<p>The Council has considered a significant number of sites across the Borough to meet its housing requirements. This includes both sites in the existing urban area and alternative sites in the Green Belt. Based on the existing evidence, the proposed sites are considered to be the most suitable and sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives. This has been addressed in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and 11.0.</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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	Pyrford is a vibrant community and place to live. Many residents have family roots here or have more here because of the delightful character of the village and it's semi-rural setting. Development will destroy this environment and	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				irrevocably change the character of the village. A massive new housing scheme will not blend in with existing houses and create a blot on the landscape.			
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	Pyrford is a vibrant community and place to live. Many residents have family roots here or have more here because of the delightful character of the village and it's semi-rural setting. Development will destroy this environment and irrevocably change the character of the village. A massive new housing scheme will not blend in with existing houses and create a blot on the landscape.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	Distributing development on smaller sites around the Borough would also spread the consequential demands for infrastructure (schools, health, utilities and public transport) and avoid large increases in traffic with associated cost and disruption of highways improvements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. 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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	Distributing development on smaller sites around the Borough would also spread the consequential demands for infrastructure (schools, health, utilities and public transport) and avoid large increases in traffic with associated cost and disruption of highways improvements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11. 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
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB12	The Council has not made the case to justify the allocation of these sites for development. Urges the Council to think again, or risk losing support of a large section of the local community.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land in the Green Belt for development post 2027 has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. By assessing a wide range of evidence, as set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD, the Council considers the site to be suitable for residential development. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
522	Marjorie	Pritchard	GB13	The Council has not made the case to justify the allocation of these sites for development. Urges the Council to think again, or risk losing support of a large section of the local community.	None stated.	The principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land in the Green Belt for development post 2027 has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. By assessing a wide range of evidence, as set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD, the Council considers the site to be suitable for residential development. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
527	Jan	Page	GB12	Objects to the proposals. Pyrford is a small beautiful village in the Green Belt and the proposed development will have a detrimental affect on it.	None stated.	The proposed allocations in Pyrford will increase the population of the area whilst reducing the amount of Green Belt. 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, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
527	Jan	Page	GB13	Objects to the proposals. Pyrford is a small beautiful village in the Green Belt and the proposed development will have a detrimental affect on it.	None stated.	The proposed allocations in Pyrford will increase the population of the area whilst reducing the amount of Green Belt. 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, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
527	Jan	Page	GB12	The increase in population will impact infrastructure, increasing traffic, and meaning there will be insufficient parking spaces and oversubscribed schools.	None 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. 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
527	Jan	Page	GB13	The increase in population will impact infrastructure, increasing traffic, and meaning there will be insufficient parking spaces and oversubscribed schools.	None 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. On parking, the Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						for 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.	
534	Lee	Price	GB12	Objects to the proposal. Bought their house due to surrounding fields for country walks, away from big housing estates and safe in the knowledge that it was Green Belt land.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. The Council's approach to Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs is 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
534	Lee	Price	GB13	Objects to the proposal. Bought their house due to surrounding fields for country walks, away from big housing estates and safe in the knowledge that it was Green Belt land.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. The Council's approach to Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs is 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
534	Lee	Price	GB12	A proposal of 50-100 houses wouldn't be too much of a problem, but the number of houses proposed is ridiculous. Please don't ruin our village and community life.	None stated.	The Core Strategy provides an indication of the amount of development and housing 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 amount of development and housing density are indicative and 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 less development as suggested or low density development could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need of the Borough. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the village has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
534	Lee	Price	GB13	A proposal of 50-100 houses wouldn't be too much of a problem, but the number of houses proposed is ridiculous. Please don't ruin our village and community life.	None stated.	The Core Strategy provides an indication of the amount of development and housing 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 amount of development and housing density are indicative and 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 less development as suggested or low density development could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need of the Borough. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the village has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
534	Lee	Price	GB12	Development would add to traffic and congestion on already busy local roads, and devastate the countryside and community.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
534	Lee	Price	GB13	Development would add to traffic and congestion on already busy local roads, and devastate the countryside and community.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
542	Bill	Pugh	GB4	Byfleet is gridlocked twice a day	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
542	Bill	Pugh	GB5	Byfleet is gridlocked twice a day	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
542	Bill	Pugh	GB4	Doesn't think the Council will take any notice, as it hasn't to the 2,500 emails already received. The Council's planning consultants haven't got a clue.	None stated.	<p>The Council has noted and considered a significant number of representations received as part of the Regulation 18 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. All the representations received have been responded to and amendments to the document will be made where appropriate. It should be noted that the Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy as well as working with the relevant stakeholders and infrastructure providers to ensure that the impact of development is minimised and supported by adequate infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD is based on a range of evidence base documents that cover a number of topics including flooding, infrastructure and landscape character. The full list is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD. It is based on this information that the Site Allocations DPD has been prepared. The Council considers its evidence to be robust and up to date.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
542	Bill	Pugh	GB5	Doesn't think the Council will take any notice, as it hasn't to the 2,500 emails already received. The Council's planning consultants haven't got a clue.	None stated.	<p>The Council has noted and considered a significant number of representations received as part of the Regulation 18 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD. All the representations received have been responded to and amendments to the document will be made where appropriate. It should be noted that the Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy as well as working with the relevant stakeholders and infrastructure providers to ensure that the impact of development is minimised and supported by adequate infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD is based on a range of evidence base documents that cover a number of topics including flooding, infrastructure and landscape character. The full list is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD. It is based on this information that the Site Allocations DPD has been prepared. The Council considers its evidence to be robust and up to date.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
542	Bill	Pugh	GB4	Flooding is an issue and developing Green Belt will make it worse.	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
542	Bill	Pugh	GB5	Flooding is an issue and developing Green Belt will make it worse.	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	No further modification is 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 partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to local communities.	of this representation
572	Christine A	Palmer	GB12	Not in favour of the village being spoilt and overcrowded by 400+ new homes.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. This issue is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
572	Christine A	Palmer	GB13	Not in favour of the village being spoilt and overcrowded by 400+ new homes.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. This issue is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
572	Christine A	Palmer	GB12	Already has trouble getting to see a doctor; hospitals and schools are full.	None stated.	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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
572	Christine A	Palmer	GB13	Already has trouble getting to see a doctor; hospitals and schools are full.	None stated.	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. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
572	Christine A	Palmer	GB12	Moved here because the village was small and green, now it is going to be spoilt. Pyrford has lots of flooded areas, and the proposals won't help.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 5.0, 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
572	Christine A	Palmer	GB13	Moved here because the village was small and green, now it is going to be spoilt. Pyrford has lots of flooded areas, and the proposals won't help.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 5.0, 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.		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.	
580	J	People	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green 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
580	J	People	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further. The proposed boundary for the Green Belt is not strong as it does not follow the physical features outlined in national guidance, but weakens the existing boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. Further to this, the Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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	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
				should not be considered for development.			
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	GB11	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.		address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book, a link with history which will be lost forever if the proposals proceed.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for intended occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Traveller related business activities would be out of keeping in such a road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB7	The site does not have safe and reasonable access to schools or other local facilities, as there are virtually no local facilities in Mayford village.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB7	An increase in the present number of Traveller pitches at the site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character, landscape and amenity of the immediate area are minimised and/ or 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. In addition, 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
580	J	People	GB7	Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to edge of centre sites with good access to jobs, shops and infrastructure. Mayford does not satisfy this criteria.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0, 9.0, and 11.0. There is potential for improvements to local infrastructure and services in Mayford, as outlined in Section 3.0 of Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Further to this, there is the opportunity at Site GB9 Egley Road Garden Centre to provide an element of small scale retail and/or community development, to enhance the currently rather dispersed provision in the Mayford area, and better meet the day to day needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the areas and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area considered before the Green Belt. No urban sites have been considered, and doubts the validity of there being no other sites across the whole Borough that are identified or suitable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB8	Accepts the proposed school as a special purpose for Green Belt land and supportive of associated mitigation measures. However, objects strongly to the leisure centre, running track and sports pitches (and associated café, parking and access) which will have major impacts on an already overloaded an unexpandable road system and is inappropriate within a residential area due to its impacts, and conflicts with the Councils stated 800m separation policy. The association of the leisure and sports proposal with the school proposal represents a lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	<p>Support for the principle of a secondary school on the site, combined with suitable mitigation measures, is noted. As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure facilities and residential properties. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority, which has granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities (this decision has not been called in by the Secretary of State). It is not considered that there has been a lack of transparency through this proposal, and the Council's standard procedures in terms of public consultation and availability of planning application documents have been followed.</p> <p>The representation regarding the existing public transport provision is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
580	J	People	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0. With regard to the justification for the development in a Green Belt location, this is addressed in Sections 1.0. and 4.0 (paragraph 4.3) of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village. This isolated community of less than a thousand dwellings will be destroyed forever, with a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact of Mayford residents who have chosen to live in a semi-rural environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.		proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	
580	J	People	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. At peaks hours, motorists take alternative routes through narrow residential streets, exacerbating the impact on residents.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures necessary, including those to deal with potential issues created by unsuitable alternative routes being used by motorists, will be informed by the Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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).	
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	<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. The character of Hook Heath is set out in the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan as well as the Council's documents such as the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The Council and Neighbourhood Plan have robust policies in place to ensure that local character is protected.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563. The response to the Hook Heath Residents Association can be found under Representor ID 470 and 1298.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	<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. The character of Hook Heath is set out in the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan as well as the Council's documents such as the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The Council and Neighbourhood Plan have robust policies in place to ensure that local character is protected.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563. The response to the Hook Heath Residents Association can be found under Representor ID 470 and 1298.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	<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. The character of Hook Heath is set out in the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan as well as the Council's documents such as the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The Council and Neighbourhood Plan have robust policies in place to ensure that local character is protected.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563. The response to the Hook Heath Residents Association can be found under Representor ID 470 and 1298.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	<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. The character of Hook Heath is set out in the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan as well as the Council's documents such as the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The Council and Neighbourhood Plan have robust policies in place to ensure that local character is protected.</p>	No further modification is 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. The response to the Hook Heath Residents Association can be found under Representor ID 470 and 1298.	
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	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
580	J	People	GB8	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
580	J	People	GB9	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.	None stated.	This representation 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
580	J	People	GB10	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.	None stated.	This representation 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
580	J	People	GB11	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station. The idea of directing traffic to 400 new homes down Saunders Lane is ridiculous, as it is a narrow road and single lane in places, including railway bridges which constrain access and result in pinchpoints. In places, houses built up to the road edge.		allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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 7.0 (paragraph 7.4), 19.0, 21.0 and 23.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
596	Ian	Pearce	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
596	Ian	Pearce	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	The site should be removed from	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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 DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>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>	
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier	The site should be removed from the DPD for	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	the reasons stated.	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.	
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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
596	Ian	Pearce	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.	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. The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity. The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
596	Ian	Pearce	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from	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	No further modification is 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.	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.	
619	Anita	Parnham	UA32	The retail proposed at Sheerwater Neighbourhood Centre should not be placed within the housing area due to disturbance and privacy of affected residents. Suggests locating it within the business park on Forsyth Road, where residents would be inconvenienced less with traffic and associated disruption.	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 or nearby properties avoiding significant harmful impacts. There are further policies to ensure that disruption is minimised in the Council's emerging Development Management Policies DPD. Traffic is 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
625	Sophia	Platts	GB12	Plans for redevelopment of the village school do not include room for further expansion eg of classrooms. Unless only retirement housing is developed, there will be an increased number of children within the village and parish who are unable to attend their village school.	None stated.	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. At this stage, the Council considers the site to be suitable for residential development for around 223 dwellings. The exact type and amount of development on the site will be considered at the planning application stage post 2027, when the site is due to be released from the Green Belt for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB13	Plans for redevelopment of the village school do not include room for further expansion e.g. of classrooms. Unless only retirement housing is developed, there will be an increased number of children within the village and parish who are unable to attend their village school.	None stated.	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. At this stage, the Council considers the site to be suitable for residential development for around 200 dwellings. The exact type and amount of development on the site will be considered at the planning application stage post 2027, when the site is due to be released from the Green Belt for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB12	Not opposed to development per se and would welcome some affordable housing in Pyrford, but does not believe the development proposed will achieve this.	None stated.	As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing as well as within the key requirements for the site, any proposed development is expected to deliver 50% affordable housing onsite. The affordable housing need in the Borough is high and this site is expected to provide a significant contribution towards meeting some of this demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB13	Not opposed to development per se and would welcome some affordable housing in Pyrford, but does not believe the development proposed will achieve this.	None stated.	As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing as well as within the key requirements for the site, any proposed development is expected to deliver 50% affordable housing onsite. The affordable housing need in the Borough is high and this site is expected to provide a significant contribution towards meeting some of this demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB12	Originally chose to live in Pyrford as it was green, had a village feel, strong sense of identity, good amenities and well-thought of school. However, now realises that the village suffers terrible traffic congestion in every direction, and the village school and local nurseries are seriously over-subscribed. Has to take her younger son to nursery 5 miles away, a 1 hour round trip. Taking this into account, appalled that the Council is turning over Green Belt land to development. Believes that doing so will fundamentally change the characteristics of the village, particularly higher density housing which will put additional burden on an already strained road network.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB13	Originally chose to live in Pyrford as it was green, had a village feel, strong sense of identity, good amenities and well-thought of school. However, now realises that the village suffers terrible traffic congestion in every direction, and the village school and local nurseries are seriously over-subscribed. Has to take her younger son to nursery 5 miles away, a 1 hour round trip. Taking this into account, appalled that the Council is turning over Green Belt land to development. Believes that doing so will fundamentally	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.8 and 3.11, and 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
				change the characteristics of the village, particularly higher density housing which will put additional burden on an already strained road network.			
625	Sophia	Platts	GB12	Understands the sites are considered safeguarded sites and the Council is choosing to depart from the recommendations of its own independent adviser.	None stated.	It is correct that the Council is intending to safeguard these two sites for development needs post 2027. The Green Belt boundary review recommended that site GB12 is suitable for development and the Council has chosen to follow this recommendation. Site GB13 was contained within Parcel 9 of the Green Belt boundary review and was not considered to be suitable based on landscape grounds. However it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is based on a range of evidence documents and not entirely on the Green Belt boundary review. These other documents include the Landscape Character Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD. Overall the Council is satisfied that these two sites are suitable for development post 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB13	Understands the sites are considered safeguarded sites and the Council is choosing to depart from the recommendations of its own independent adviser.	None stated.	It is correct that the Council is intending to safeguard these two sites for development needs post 2027. The Green Belt boundary review recommended that site GB12 is suitable for development and the Council has chosen to follow this recommendation. Site GB13 was contained within Parcel 9 of the Green Belt boundary review and was not considered to be suitable based on landscape grounds. However it should be noted that the Site Allocations DPD is based on a range of evidence documents and not entirely on the Green Belt boundary review. These other documents include the Landscape Character Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the DPD. Overall the Council is satisfied that these two sites are suitable for development post 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB12	Urges the Council to take account of the village's strong opposition to the plans and work with residents to find innovative ways to develop Pyrford sensitively, to preserve the village and avoid turning it into a character-less, deadlocked Woking suburb.	None stated.	The Council has considered the points raised by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and local residents. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out various studies to inform the selection of sites in the Site Allocations DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the sites in Pyrford. The proposed allocations in the DPD are the most sustainable to meet the development needs of the area when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Council will work with the Neighbourhood Forum and residents to make sure that any development that comes forward is of high quality design that does not detract from the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB13	Urges the Council to take account of the village's strong opposition to the plans and work with residents to find innovative ways to develop Pyrford sensitively, to preserve the village and avoid turning it into a character-less, deadlocked Woking suburb.	None stated.	The Council has considered the points raised by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum and local residents. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out various studies to inform the selection of sites in the Site Allocations DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the sites in Pyrford. The proposed allocations in the DPD are the most sustainable to meet the development needs of the area when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Council will work with the Neighbourhood Forum and residents to make sure that any development that comes forward is of high quality design that does not detract from the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
625	Sophia	Platts	GB12	Outlines the (excessive) time taken to travel by car to Brooklands and Leatherhead due to congestion, and yet the Council wishes to create further traffic on these roads, which is unavoidable due to the poor bus service and distance to either local railway station.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. The poor bus service 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
625	Sophia	Platts	GB13	Outlines the (excessive) time taken to travel by car to Brooklands and Leatherhead due to congestion, and yet the Council wishes to create further traffic on these roads, which is unavoidable due to the poor bus service and distance to either local railway station.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. The poor bus service 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
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	Objects to the proposal as there is no coverage of how local infrastructure will support the extra people, particularly in terms of schools, doctors, dentists and hospital capacity. More people will risk lives due to overstretched hospitals.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	Was told when buying her house that the land opposite was both Green Belt, contained protected oak trees and was part of the Farnborough airfield safety zone. Does this not count anymore?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 1.0. Development proposals will need meet all other relevant Development Plan Policies including robust policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies which seek to protect and encourage the creation of Green Infrastructure including trees. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Also, this proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes the retention of boundary planting, mature trees, tree belts and the requirement to conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	Outlines the Home Secretary's preference for brownfield land for new housing schemes, as Green Belt schemes usually entail high volume housing and new infrastructure. Can not see any thought about investment in new infrastructure plans. The A320 is at capacity now.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	It will devastate local 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 and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	Increased traffic will raise pollution and noise levels in the area	None stated.	With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	It's a money making scheme for the Council to get more Council tax and for developers to make a big profit with no thought to the current residents.	None stated.	The Council is seeking to deliver the development needs set out in the adopted Core Strategy. This is fully explained in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	One of the few things you can choose in life is where you live. Has been lucky to live in Mayford for 9 years, chosen for the space around it and low volume housing. If I'd wanted to live on a housing estate I would saved money and moved to Goldsworth Park!	None stated.	The significant housing need has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The Council is committed to enabling access to decent, affordable housing for local people, and the Core Strategy seeks to address this need. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	The field opposite site GB10 is contaminated and if approved would be a risk to health of local people.	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 are identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	The site is prone to flooding and causes flooding on Saunders Lane. There is no mention of how this will be dealt with.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	There is no mention of how the Council will deal with increased car volumes and traffic, on already congested roads and with the new development in Woking town centre taking place.	None stated.	This representation 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
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	There is no mention of the pressure the new homes will put on utilities. How will sewers cope? Guesses they won't cope requiring further upheaval, disruption and noise (digging up roads) to fix the problem.	None stated.	With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	There isn't a decent bus service and insufficient parking space at Worplesdon station.	None stated.	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
637	Sarah	Plastow	GB10	The Council is committing a terrible injustice to the people of Mayford who have chosen and paid to live in a semi-rural location. The proposed scale of housing will have a devastating effect, by making Mayford overrun with people and houses. It will devalue my house, and risk my health with contamination and pressure on local health services.	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet development need beyond the plan period is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. It is not considered that Mayford will become 'over run with people and houses' as adequate infrastructure is expected to support the proposed allocations (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and in terms of impact on local amenity, well being and character, see Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper. In terms of potential contamination at 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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB10	Additional people will add to pressure on the existing infrastructure in Woking. The existing healthcare facilities are already at capacity.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The representation regarding infrastructure in general 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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB11	Additional people will add to pressure on the existing infrastructure in Woking. The existing healthcare facilities are already at capacity.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The representation regarding infrastructure in general 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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB14	Additional people will add to pressure on the existing infrastructure in Woking. The existing healthcare facilities are already at capacity.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The representation regarding infrastructure in general 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
661	Michael	Plastow	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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB7	Woking Traveller's sites are all located in one area of the borough. Mayford already contributes towards the Traveller Community and there is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
661	Michael	Plastow	GB10	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
661	Michael	Plastow	GB11	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
661	Michael	Plastow	GB14	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
661	Michael	Plastow	GB10	Additional strain on trains which are already at capacity	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
661	Michael	Plastow	GB11	Additional strain on trains which are already at capacity	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
661	Michael	Plastow	GB14	Additional strain on trains which are already at capacity	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	
661	Michael	Plastow	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites 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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites 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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out as well as an increased risk to wildlife on the Heaths as they are in close proximity	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites 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>	
661	Michael	Plastow	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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB10	The site currently floods and development will create further flooding issues.	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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB10	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p>	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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB11	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p>	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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB14	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
661	Michael	Plastow	GB14	Removing the fields will result in no where for children to play. Residents will have to drive their children to other play facilities, creating more traffic	None stated.	The draft allocation for the site is for green infrastructure and not for development. One of the key requirements for the site specifically states that the site must contribute to addressing deficiencies in leisure and open space in the area. In combination with GB19, it is expected that the local area will have a wide range of open space and recreational facilities in the local area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
661	Michael	Plastow	GB10	Removing the fields will result in no where for children to play. Residents will have to drive their children to other play facilities, creating more traffic	None stated.	The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition,	No further modification is 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>Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.</p> <p>It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG). The proposed allocation of this site for development is therefore not considered to result in additional traffic and congestion due to residents driving to alternative recreation facilities.</p>	
661	Michael	Plastow	GB11	Removing the fields will result in no where for children to play. Residents will have to drive their children to other play facilities, creating more traffic	None stated.	<p>The draft allocation notes in the key requirements that development must improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space. This is important in making sure existing and future residents have safe and convenient access to recreation space. This is further supported by the requirement to retain the existing footpaths and Rights of Way through the site. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.</p> <p>It should be noted that proposed site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure whilst GB19 is allocated as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG). The proposed allocation of this site for development is therefore not considered to result in additional traffic and congestion due to residents driving to alternative recreation facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB8	Wildlife will be at risk in the local area, which will effect future generations.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB9	Wildlife will be at risk in the local area, which will effect future generations.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Monitoring (SAMM).	
672	T	Pike	GB10	Wildlife will be at risk in the local area, which will effect future generations.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB11	Wildlife will be at risk in the local area, which will effect future generations.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB14	Wildlife will be at risk in the local area, which will effect future generations.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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>	
672	T	Pike	GB7	Currently live in an overcrowded area so value the Green Belt. Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site previously because they would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB8	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB9	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB10	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB11	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB14	Housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning it into a suburb and increasing the risk of merging Woking and Guildford. No assessment of preserving Mayford as a separate village or the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	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 and an increase in rubbish.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
672	T	Pike	GB8	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>There is very poor public transport in Mayford which means more people will drive, creating further traffic and congestion.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB9	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>There is very poor public transport in Mayford which means more people will drive, creating further traffic and congestion.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB10	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>There is very poor public transport in Mayford which means more people will drive, creating further traffic and congestion.</p> <p>Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB11	<p>No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road.</p> <p>Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>There is very poor public transport in Mayford which means</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				more people will drive, creating further traffic and congestion. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.		essential.	
672	T	Pike	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. More people will result in more cars and strain on transport infrastructure. There are no plans to upgrade the roads, bridges or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. There is very poor public transport in Mayford which means more people will drive, creating further traffic and congestion. Prey Heath Road will be dangerous with people walking to the station.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB7	Object to increasing the number of Travellers Pitches at this site. Woking Traveller's sites are all located in one area of the borough. Mayford already contributes towards the Traveller Community and there is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
672	T	Pike	GB8	Urge you to reconsider the plans which would change Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and offers a rural charm to a busy and thriving commercial landscape.	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
672	T	Pike	GB9	Urge you to reconsider the plans which would change Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and offers a rural charm to a busy and thriving commercial landscape.	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
672	T	Pike	GB10	Urge you to reconsider the plans which would change Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and offers a rural charm to a busy and thriving commercial landscape.	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
672	T	Pike	GB11	Urge you to reconsider the plans which would change Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and offers a rural charm to a busy and thriving commercial landscape.	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
672	T	Pike	GB14	Urge you to reconsider the plans which would change Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and offers a rural charm to a busy and thriving commercial landscape.	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
677	A	Pullen	General	West Byfleet will lose 80-90% of its Green Belt compared to 3.4% of the overall borough. Consider other sites not just the easy to buy ones like West Hall. Use one of the other 21 pockets of land instead.	My suggestion under point 5 to spread out the number of homes over the 21 pockets of Green Belt already earmarked would mean that all the objectives above would be satisfied, please consider this suggestion respectfully.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggests that the sites proposed for allocation in West Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).</p> <p>The Council has assessed 125 alternative sites in the Green Belt for development. These are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which is available on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
677	A	Pullen	GB15	If the proposals go ahead the Council will need a new centre with many more doctors and nurses as the existing is at capacity.	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
677	A	Pullen	GB16	If the proposals go ahead the Council will need a new centre with many more doctors and nurses as the existing is at capacity.	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
677	A	Pullen	GB15	Some of the smaller roads including Coldharbour and Highfield road will have at least a 90% increase in traffic and the roads will not last through it and will need to be replaced.	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 transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
677	A	Pullen	GB16	Some of the smaller roads including Coldharbour and Highfield road will have at least a 90% increase in traffic and the roads will not last through it and will need to be replaced.	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 transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and</p>	No further modification is 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>	
677	A	Pullen	GB15	<p>The impact on transport in the area will be impossible. There are no possible alternatives to this as there are no opportunities for new or wider roads.</p> <p>The proposed school will add a significant amount of traffic on the roads and parking will be an issue.</p> <p>Highfield Road will continue to be a dangerous cut through.</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 key requirements for Site GB15 note that a roundabout should be provided in order to achieve a safe entrance onto the site from Parvis Road. This is based on the findings of the County Highways Authority who are responsible for the highways in the area as well as highways safety.</p> <p>It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
677	A	Pullen	GB16	<p>The impact on transport in the area will be impossible. There are no possible alternatives to this as there are no opportunities for new or wider 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.</p>	No further modification is 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 proposed school will add a significant amount of traffic on the roads and parking will be an issue.</p> <p>Highfield Road will continue to be a dangerous cut through.</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 key requirements for Site GB15 note that a roundabout should be provided in order to achieve a safe entrance onto the site from Parvis Road. This is based on the findings of the County Highways Authority who are responsible for the highways in the area as well as highways safety.</p> <p>It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	
677	A	Pullen	GB16	The proposed playing fields are not large enough and the recreation ground will be used instead, to the disadvantage of the local community.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
677	A	Pullen	GB16	The proposed houses are expensive and will not help the local housing market - smaller houses should be provided and fewer of them.	None stated.	<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 on development schemes throughout the Borough to meet local need.</p> <p>The Council notes the suggestion for smaller and fewer homes. Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing mix sets out that development proposals should provide a wide range of properties based on local housing need. The successful implementation of the policy should ensure that there is a wide range of housing types available within the Borough.</p> <p>By providing fewer houses, the Council will not deliver the Core Strategy in full, which sets out that 4,964 dwellings will be delivered over the plan period. The Council is fully committed to meeting this figure in full in order to meet local housing need. By providing fewer dwellings on the site, the Council would be required to identify more land in the Green Belt for development needs. The proposed densities are in line with Core Strategy Policy CS10.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
677	A	Pullen	GB16	The proposed school is massive and will not cater for local children, hence more people travelling into West Byfleet. My proposal is to use the site for offices.	My proposal would be for offices where	The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important	No further modification is 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 maximum number of staff would be 400.	employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits. The Council therefore agrees with the representation that the site should be used primarily for employment purposes.	
677	A	Pullen	General	The strategy of the council is to develop in Urban areas, West Byfleet is a village.	None stated.	As set out in the Core Strategy, most of the new development will be directed to previously developed land in the town, district and local centres, which offers the best access to a range of services and facilities. Core Strategy Policy CS3 states that West Byfleet is the second largest centre in the Borough. Due to its size, range of uses and accessibility it has been designated as the only District Centre in the Borough. The policy is clear in setting out the spatial vision for West Byfleet and the Council is committed to the comprehensive delivery of the policy and overall Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
677	A	Pullen	General	Traffic will be worse with other developments taking place in Pyrford, Sheerwater and Ripley.	None stated.	The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway, which includes 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
677	A	Pullen	General	The 592 dwellings and 157 at Broadoaks is more than the 550 set out in the Core Strategy. These 550 should be spread out to 50 dwellings across the 21 'pocket' sites across 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 West Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The 592 dwellings stated in the Site Allocations DPD is based on an indicative density of 40 dwellings per hectare. 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. The Site Allocations DPD proposes that Broadoaks be used for high quality office and research premises with an element of housing. The stated 157 dwellings is a developer led proposal that is being assessed on its own merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
693	Christine	Pring	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Green Belt should not be used for housing. The village should not be eroded.	None stated.	The representation regarding the need to release Green Belt land for development needs 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
693	Christine	Pring	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Green Belt should not be used for housing. The village should not be eroded.	None stated.	The representation regarding the need to release Green Belt land for development needs 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
693	Christine	Pring	GB12	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
693	Christine	Pring	GB13	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
693	Christine	Pring	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
693	Christine	Pring	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. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
693	Christine	Pring	GB12	The atmosphere of the village will be ruined and take away the reasons why residents moved to the area in the first place	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
693	Christine	Pring	GB13	The atmosphere of the village will be ruined and take away the reasons why residents moved to the area in the first place	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
734	Susan	Phillips	GB4	The infrastructure can not cope at present	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
734	Susan	Phillips	GB5	The infrastructure can not cope at present	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
734	Susan	Phillips	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
734	Susan	Phillips	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
734	Susan	Phillips	GB4	Byfleet frequently floods or is at risk of flooding and this has not be addressed.	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
734	Susan	Phillips	GB5	Byfleet frequently floods or is at risk of flooding and this has not be addressed.	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
734	Susan	Phillips	GB4	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
734	Susan	Phillips	GB5	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
734	Susan	Phillips	Consultation and next steps	Byfleet must have a voice and all other brownfield sites should be considered, including those close to better amenities that can support development.	None stated.	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) provides a comprehensive assessment of all of the alternative sites considered by the Council in both the existing urban area and Green Belt. The Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0 set this out in further detail.</p> <p>The Council believes that the sites within the Site Allocations DPD are the most sustainable based on their proximity to local services and facilities. 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
734	Susan	Phillips	GB4	The Green Belt must be preserved and there must be other land available for development. The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. It will also increase urban sprawl and Byfleet will loose its unique individuality.	None stated.	<p>The Council commissioned a Green Belt boundary review in order to carry out a borough-wide review of the Green Belt to meet future development needs. The review identified a number of sites to be considered for development and the Council is satisfied that the proposed allocated sites are in the most sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. It is emphasised that the Green Belt boundary review report is only one of a number of evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The 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 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>Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD provide robust design policy and guidance to make sure that new development creates buildings and places that make a positive contribution to the character of the area in which they are situated. Therefore it is not expected that development of the proposed allocated site would have a significant harmful</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						impact on the character of Byfleet.	
734	Susan	Phillips	GB5	The Green Belt must be preserved and there must be other land available for development. The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. It will also increase urban sprawl and Byfleet will lose its unique individuality.	None stated.	<p>The Council commissioned a Green Belt boundary review in order to carry out a borough-wide review of the Green Belt to meet future development needs. The review identified a number of sites to be considered for development and the Council is satisfied that the proposed allocated sites are in the most sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. It is emphasised that the Green Belt boundary review report is only one of a number of evidence base studies used to inform the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The 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 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>Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD provide robust design policy and guidance to make sure that new development creates buildings and places that make a positive contribution to the character of the area in which they are situated. Therefore it is not expected that development of the proposed allocated site would have a significant harmful impact on the character of Byfleet.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
734	Susan	Phillips	GB5	The schools are at capacity, and Murrays Lane is a bottleneck with traffic. Without the necessary infrastructure, the proposals will result in overdevelopment of the area. This includes schools, health care, flooding, amenity, roads, parking and public transport.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>In addition, the various transport studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</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
						<p>the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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>	
743	Mary	Penn	GB10	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
743	Mary	Penn	GB11	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
743	Mary	Penn	GB14	There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. It should also be noted that this site is allocated for green infrastructure and not development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
743	Mary	Penn	GB7	Object to increasing Traveller pitches as the area already provides a large number. It is not necessary or appropriate.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
743	Mary	Penn	General	Refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	The response of the Mayford Village Society to the Regulation 18 consultation has been considered and responded to separately.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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	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
					the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	<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>	
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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 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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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.	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. The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure	No further modification is 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>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>	
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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.	<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 cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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.	<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 cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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 cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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.	<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 cooperation relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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.	<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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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.	<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</p>	No further modification is 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 future detailed planning application stage.	
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density. The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	None stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the SHLAA (2015) the site would only be deliverable or developable during the Plan period subject to it being released from the Green Belt through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is therefore pursuing the use of the site for Travellers accommodation through the Plan led process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Domesday Book.		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.	
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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	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
				would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.		<p>and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egle Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of 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 Egle Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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 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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
779	Geoffrey	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						of the 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.	
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.		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.	of this representation
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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 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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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	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
				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.		grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity. The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	of this representation
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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	None stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming	No further modification is 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. 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.		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.	
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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	No further modification is 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>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>	
780	Rosina	Painter	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.	<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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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	No further modification is 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>	
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
780	Rosina	Painter	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. 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
780	Rosina	Painter	GB11	<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. 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
780	Rosina	Painter	GB8	<p>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.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.</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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
780	Rosina	Painter	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
783	Mike and Libby	Punter	GB4	Leave the Green Belt alone and don't build on flood plains. Development may increase flood risk to other properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
783	Mike and Libby	Punter	GB5	Leave the Green Belt alone and don't build on flood plains. Development may increase flood risk to other properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
783	Mike and Libby	Punter	GB4	Objects about Green Belt and gridlock. Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford as well as surrounding areas are gridlocked. This results in air pollution issues. There are knock on effects for emergency services. Speeding is also an issue as is noise pollution from the M25. Overall this has had a negative impact on the quality of life for local residents. There are other options to building on Green Belt and before any development, the A245 needs to be addressed. A bypass should have been considered as the road is constrained.	Consider building a bypass for the A245	<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
						<p>seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council's response to alternative sites for development is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation and proposed modification regarding a new bypass for the A245 to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
783	Mike and Libby	Punter	GB5	Objects about Green Belt and gridlock. Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford as well as surrounding areas are gridlocked. This results in air pollution issues. There are knock on effects for emergency services. Speeding is also an issue as is noise pollution from the M25. Overall this has had a negative impact on the quality of life for local residents. There are other options to building on Green Belt and before any development, the A245 needs to be addressed. A bypass should have been considered as the road is constrained.	Consider building a bypass for the A245	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council's response to alternative sites for development is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation and proposed modification regarding a new bypass for the A245 to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
783	Mike and Libby	Punter	GB4	Need to address the existing infrastructure that are at capacity before any further development is considered.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the area.	
783	Mike and Libby	Punter	GB5	Need to address the existing infrastructure that are at capacity before any further development is considered.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB4	Objects to Green Belt proposals. Why release Green Belt in areas saturated with housing. There are plenty of open spaces in other areas like Cobham, Winkfield and Camberley.	Consider development in Cobham, Winkfield and Camberley	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing within their housing market area. The Council is therefore committed to meeting its housing requirements as set out in the Core Strategy, within the Borough, to meet local housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB5	Objects to Green Belt proposals. Why release Green Belt in areas saturated with housing. There are plenty of open spaces in other areas like Cobham, Winkfield and Camberley.	Consider development in Cobham, Winkfield and Camberley	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to use their evidence to make sure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing within their housing market area. The Council is therefore committed to meeting its housing requirements as set out in the Core Strategy, within the Borough, to meet local housing need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	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
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB4	The existing infrastructure is inadequate. Flooding is getting worse.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding and infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB5	The existing infrastructure is inadequate. Flooding is getting worse.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding and infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB4	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB5	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. Byfleet and West Byfleet will merge and the identity of the village will be lost.	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 Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Although the proposed site allocation will reduce the gap between West Byfleet and Byfleet, it will not result in them merging together. There will still remain a significant gap between Byfleet and West Byfleet which includes a proposed SANG and the M25.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
804	Linda	Pitchford Jones	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. Byfleet and West Byfleet will merge and the identity of the village will be lost.	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%</p>	No further modification is 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>(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 Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Although the proposed site allocation will reduce the gap between West Byfleet and Byfleet, it will not result in them merging together. The Green Belt boundary review notes that by realigning the boundary it will retain a wedge of Green Belt between new development and the M25, thus maintaining a separation between Byfleet and West Byfleet.</p>	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB7	Has the location of the site been taken into consideration. It is next to an SSSI which is used by locals for recreational purposes. The proposal will not be in keeping with the area and may have a negative impact on local wildlife. Ask to reconsider the proposal to an area with better facilities.	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>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
818	Wes	Pickering	GB8	Strongly object to proposals in Mayford as they would have a hugely detrimental effect on the local environment and community.	None stated.	<p>It is envisaged that planning to meet the Borough's housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the Borough. 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 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.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife</p>	No further modification is 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>Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB9	Strongly object to proposals in Mayford as they would have a hugely detrimental effect on the local environment and community.	None stated.	<p>It is envisaged that planning to meet the Borough's housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the Borough. 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 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.</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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB10	Strongly object to proposals in Mayford as they would have a hugely detrimental effect on the local environment and community.	None stated.	<p>It is envisaged that planning to meet the Borough's housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the Borough. 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 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</p>	No further modification is 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>number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB11	Strongly object to proposals in Mayford as they would have a hugely detrimental effect on the local environment and community.	None stated.	<p>It is envisaged that planning to meet the Borough's housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the Borough. 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 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.</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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB14	Strongly object to proposals in Mayford as they would have a hugely detrimental effect on the local environment and community.	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that site GB14 is allocated for green infrastructure and not for development. With this in mind there is expected to be no adverse impacts on the local environment or community by allocating this site. More information is set out within the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
818	Wes	Pickering	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs.	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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs.	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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs.	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>	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs.	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
818	Wes	Pickering	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. Prey and Smarts Heath are 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 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
						Monitoring (SAMM).	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB10	Saunders Lane floods on a regular basis. Further development without significant investment would make surface water flooding worse for the road network and surrounding properties. Object to the proposals as they will have a devastating impact on the community. 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 flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</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 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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB11	Saunders Lane floods on a regular basis. Further development without significant investment would make surface water flooding worse for the road network and surrounding properties. Object to the proposals as they will have a devastating impact on the community. 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 flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</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 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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB8	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and there are no plans for healthcare facilities, public transport and difficult access to some of the roads in the area. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems. Due to the isolated nature of the proposals, car usage will increase.	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 GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 situation 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 representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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 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>	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB9	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and there are no plans for healthcare facilities, public transport and difficult access to some of the roads in the area. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems. Due to the isolated nature of the proposals, car usage will increase.	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 GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 situation 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 representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB10	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and there are no plans for healthcare facilities, public transport and difficult access to some of the roads in the area. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems. Due to the isolated nature of the proposals, car usage will increase.	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 GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 situation 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 representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB11	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and there are no plans for healthcare facilities, public transport and difficult access to some of the roads in the area. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems. Due to the isolated nature of the proposals, car usage will increase.	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 GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 situation 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 representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB14	The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and there are no plans for healthcare facilities, public transport and difficult access to some of the roads in the area. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions	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</p>	No further modification is 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 deal with the existing traffic problems. Due to the isolated nature of the proposals, car usage will increase.		<p>retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 situation 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 representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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 adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian and 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> <p>It should also be noted that the site is not proposed for development but for green infrastructure.</p>	
818	Wes	Pickering	GB8	Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. It will be lost as Mayford is absorbed into Woking and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. Mayford will have no identity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
818	Wes	Pickering	GB9	Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. It will be lost as Mayford is absorbed into Woking and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. Mayford will have no identity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB10	Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. It will be lost as Mayford is absorbed into Woking and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. Mayford will have no identity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
818	Wes	Pickering	GB11	Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. It will be lost as Mayford is absorbed into Woking and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. Mayford will have no identity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
818	Wes	Pickering	GB14	Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. It will be lost as Mayford is absorbed into Woking and lead to the merging of Woking and Guildford. Mayford will have no identity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
818	Wes	Pickering	GB7	Mayford has poor infrastructure, including transport, medical and education facilities. Traveller pitches in this location would mean that these resources are provided by other parts of the borough so it would make more sense to locate this proposal in an area with these facilities.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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 lack of public transport 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
818	Wes	Pickering	GB7	Object to the proposals due to the impact on Mayford. Has consideration been given to brownfield sites for a Travellers site. The current provision are all in this area of the borough and there must be other sites suitable rather than a green field site that has to be converted.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.5 to 4.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
818	Wes	Pickering	GB10	The proposal will result in significantly more properties than at present and would have a negative effect on existing residents.	None stated.	It is correct that the draft Site Allocations DPD will increase the number of properties located on Saunders Lane (Site GB10 and GB11). 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
818	Wes	Pickering	GB11	The proposal will result in significantly more properties than at present and would have a negative effect on existing residents.	None stated.	It is correct that the draft Site Allocations DPD will increase the number of properties located on Saunders Lane (Site GB10 and GB11). 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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB4	A245 needs a bypass. It is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. Emergency services encounter difficulties.	The A245 needs a bypass	<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.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council note the proposal for a bypass to the A245 and will draw it to the County Council's attention.</p>	
823	Lynne	Pope	GB5	A245 needs a bypass. It is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. Emergency services encounter difficulties.	The A245 needs a bypass	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council note the proposal for a bypass to the A245 and will draw it to the County Council's attention.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
823	Lynne	Pope	GB4	Byfleet will be gridlocked	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
						<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>	
823	Lynne	Pope	GB5	Byfleet will be gridlocked	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB4	Flooding has taken place on much of the proposed area and the already developed sites	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB5	Flooding has taken place on much of the proposed area and the already developed sites	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB4	Object to Green Belt release	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB5	Object to Green Belt release	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB4	Reiterate existing comments and oppositions. Green Belt must be preserved.	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB5	Reiterate existing comments and oppositions. Green Belt must be preserved.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
823	Lynne	Pope	GB4	Infrastructure is inadequate to support existing residents	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB5	Infrastructure is inadequate to support existing residents	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
823	Lynne	Pope	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
823	Lynne	Pope	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB8	As there are no plans to improve the infrastructure, it will have a negative effect on existing residents as the village will not be able to cope.	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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people.</p> <p>Planning permission has also recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB9	As there are no plans to improve the infrastructure, it will have a negative effect on existing residents as the village will not be able to cope.	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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people.</p> <p>Planning permission has also recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB10	As there are no plans to improve the infrastructure, it will have a negative effect on existing residents as the village will not be able to cope.	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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people.</p> <p>Planning permission has also recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB11	As there are no plans to improve the infrastructure, it will have a negative effect on existing residents as the village will not be able to cope.	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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people.</p> <p>Planning permission has also recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB14	As there are no plans to improve the infrastructure, it will have a negative effect on existing residents as the village will not be able to cope.	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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people.</p> <p>Planning permission has also recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB14	Objects to the proposal. Mayford has no supporting infrastructure for such a significant increase in properties.	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 Council will continue to work with service providers to see whether infrastructure 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB8	Objects to the proposal. Mayford has no supporting infrastructure for such a significant increase in properties.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with service providers to see whether infrastructure provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB9	Objects to the proposal. Mayford has no supporting infrastructure for such a significant increase in properties.	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 Council will continue to work with service providers to see whether infrastructure 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB10	Objects to the proposal. Mayford has no supporting infrastructure for such a significant increase in properties.	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 Council will continue to work with service providers to see whether infrastructure 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB11	Objects to the proposal. Mayford has no supporting infrastructure for such a significant increase in properties.	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 Council will continue to work with service providers to see whether infrastructure 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB8	The village will lose its identity and history as it is absorbed into Woking	None stated.	<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>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB9	The village will lose its identity and history as it is absorbed into Woking	None stated.	<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>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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB10	The village will lose its identity and history as it is absorbed into Woking	None stated.	<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>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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB11	The village will lose its identity and history as it is absorbed into Woking	None stated.	<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>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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB14	The village will lose its identity and history as it is absorbed into Woking	None stated.	<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>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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB8	Local roads and bridges are already congested and will not be able to cope with additional traffic. Urge the Council to consider other suitable locations within the borough.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The representation regarding alternative sites in the borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB9	Local roads and bridges are already congested and will not be able to cope with additional traffic. Urge the Council to consider other suitable locations within the borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The representation regarding alternative sites in the borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB10	Local roads and bridges are already congested and will not be able to cope with additional traffic. Urge the Council to consider other suitable locations within the borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The representation regarding alternative sites in the borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB11	Local roads and bridges are already congested and will not be able to cope with additional traffic. Urge the Council to consider other suitable locations within the borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The representation regarding alternative sites in the borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB14	Local roads and bridges are already congested and will not be able to cope with additional traffic. Urge the Council to consider other suitable locations within the borough.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The representation regarding alternative sites in the borough has been addressed in the Council's 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
						<p>Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The representation regarding alternative sites in the borough has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0.</p>	
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB8	The proposals will lead to the loss of wildlife and negative impact on the local environment.	None stated.	<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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB9	The proposals will lead to the loss of wildlife and negative impact on the local environment.	None stated.	<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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB10	The proposals will lead to the loss of wildlife and negative impact on the local environment.	None stated.	<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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	No further modification is 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>	
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB11	The proposals will lead to the loss of wildlife and negative impact on the local environment.	None stated.	<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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
831	Sharon	Pickering	GB14	The proposals will lead to the loss of wildlife and negative impact on the local environment.	None stated.	<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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
843	Zaria	Pinchbeck	General	Byfleet will become gridlocked and the infrastructure is already inadequate.	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</p>	No further modification is 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>impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	
843	Zaria	Pinchbeck	General	Objects to release of Green Belt land in Byfleet. It should be preserved for environmental and social reasons.	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
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB4	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	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
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB5	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB12	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB13	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB15	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB16	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA49	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA51	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA52	Green Belt should be preserved as other land available.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12, Section 2, Section 9.0 paragraph 9.2 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB4	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB5	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB12	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB13	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB15	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB16	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA49	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA51	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA52	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk. Why has the Byfleet Petition with 2,500 been ignored? Please take into account all local residents comments.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB4	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB5	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB12	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
							of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB13	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB15	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB16	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA49	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA51	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA52	Concerned about Byfleet flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB4	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB5	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB12	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB13	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB15	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB16	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA49	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA51	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA52	Current road and drain infrastructure problems should be fixed before development takes place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB4	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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
						<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>	
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB5	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB12	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB13	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB15	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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
856	Zuzana	Perry	GB16	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA49	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA51	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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>	
856	Zuzana	Perry	UA52	Concerned about the effect on traffic, especially Parvis Road (A245), as roads already very congested.	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
871	G	Pazmanyi	GB11	Questions what will happen to the Council's green infrastructure used by the Village Hall and Bowling Club. There is a need for more green infrastructure rather than the loss of areas.	None stated.	As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS17, there will be a presumption against any development that involves the loss of a sport, recreation or play facility. The Council will seek that the existing facility is retained or reprovided and enhanced as set out in national and local planning policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
871	G	Pazmanyi	GB11	The western half of the field is prone to flooding which overflows into Saunders Lane.	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
871	G	Pazmanyi	GB11	Site GB11 is used daily for recreation.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
871	G	Pazmanyi	GB11	Please leave it as Green Belt. 2027-40 is a long way off and housing-needs change, the decision should be deferred until 2022.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
871	G	Pazmanyi	GB11	Saunders lane is too narrow and used as a rat run with speeding traffic, development will make this 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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>	
871	G	Pazmanyi	GB11	Alarmed by level of housing development proposed on such a nice area. Proposed 30dph will be out of character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 18.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
871	G	Pazmanyi	GB11	Development will destroy the countryside character and views of the area.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
878	P	Petch	GB12	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt. 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 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
878	P	Petch	GB13	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt. 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 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
878	P	Petch	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Rural setting of village would be lost. Traffic is gridlocked, additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 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> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
878	P	Petch	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Rural setting of village would be lost. Traffic is gridlocked, additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0. 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. Please also see 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
879	Lorraine	Parsons	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Will negatively affect the village feel of Pyrford. The road network is under pressure and additional homes will make the situation worse. Pyrford School 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 23.0 and Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
879	Lorraine	Parsons	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Will negatively affect the village feel of Pyrford. The road network is under pressure and additional homes will make the situation worse. Pyrford School 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 23.0 and Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 and 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
879	Lorraine	Parsons	GB12	Will negatively affect the village feel of Pyrford due to the increased number of households in the community.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. The Council's decision to identify Green Belt land for development to meet medium and long term local housing needs is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
879	Lorraine	Parsons	GB13	Will negatively affect the village feel of Pyrford due to the increased number of households in the community.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. The Council's decision to identify Green Belt land for development to meet medium and long term local housing needs is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
879	Lorraine	Parsons	GB12	The sites meet the five conditions of the greenbelt policy and therefore are contrary to government policy. Stops WTC sprawl; acts as a barrier to towns merging; Pyrford is historic mentioned in Domesday book and 12th century church; isn't urban/derelect land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0, 16.0, 19.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
879	Lorraine	Parsons	GB13	The sites meet the five conditions of the greenbelt policy and therefore are contrary to government policy. Stops WTC sprawl; acts as a barrier to towns merging; Pyrford is historic mentioned in Domesday book and 12th century church; isn't urban/derelect land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0, 16.0, 19.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
880	Paul	Parsons	GB12	Will negatively affect the village feel of Pyrford due to the increased number of households in the community and overdevelopment of the village. Object to the loss of open fields.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on the character of the village has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. The representation regarding the impact on transport has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on amenity and well being has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0. The Council believes that the sites identified in the draft Site Allocations DPD are the most sustainable when compared against all reasonable alternatives. The Council is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to make sure infrastructure meets local demands and keeps up with development. In addition, the Council is fully committed to the delivery of the Core Strategy that facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the plan period. The Council is also proposing to safeguard land for future development needs, including this site, to ensure that the Green Belt boundary is not reviewed again within the next few years in preparation for the next local plan and to be consistent with national planning policy (NPPF). More information on this is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
880	Paul	Parsons	GB13	Will negatively affect the village feel of Pyrford due to the increased number of households in the community and overdevelopment of the village. Object to the loss of open fields.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact on the character of the village has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on transport has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on amenity and well being has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that the sites identified in the draft Site Allocations DPD are the most sustainable when compared against all reasonable alternatives. The Council is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to make sure infrastructure meets local demands and keeps up with development. In addition, the Council is fully committed to the delivery of the Core Strategy that facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the plan period. The Council is also proposing to safeguard land for future development needs, including this site, to ensure that the Green Belt boundary is not reviewed again within the next few years in preparation for the next local plan and to be consistent with national planning policy (NPPF). More information on this is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	Most housing at Barnsbury is now privately owned and property values would fall.	None stated.	<p>The Council has a robust policy framework to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship with neighbouring properties. This includes the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design SPD and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Through good design the proposed allocations are not expected to reduce land/or property values in the wider area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	Will adversely affect the outlook, mature trees, privacy and security of back garden which will adjoin new development.	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation of this site is for up to 55 net additional dwellings. The proposed site boundary is set out within the Site Allocations DPD. This is based on the previously permitted planning permission in 2006 (PLAN/2006/0386).</p> <p>The Council has considered the impact of the proposed developments on the local area. This is set out within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which is available on the Council's website. The Site Allocations DPD also includes a specific list of key requirements which any proposed scheme would have to address as part of any planning application.</p> <p>The matters highlighted by the representation including the loss of amenity space, impact on wildlife and biodiversity, outlook and privacy will be considered in detail at the Development Management stage. At this stage, the Site Allocations DPD states that the site is capable and suitable for up to 55 dwellings over the next 6-10 years.</p> <p>Nevertheless it should be noted that the Council has a robust policy framework to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship with surrounding buildings. This includes Core Strategy Policy CS21, The Design SPD and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	There aren't enough school places and other facilities required by new families.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	Local residents have not been easily made away of the public consultation and nearly missed the deadline.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed 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
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	Development of back gardens now is even more unsuitable due to increased population and traffic compared to previous discussions regarding the development.	None stated.	<p>It is necessary for the Council to identify sufficient land to deliver housing to meet the identified housing need. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>With regards to the impact 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>As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access to ensure highway safety. The key requirements also note that major highway improvements are likely to 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
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	Local facilities are almost non existent so people will have to drive or use public transport. The Barnsbury Bus has limited capacity.	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation is located within walking and cycling distance of local shops and community facilities. In addition, the key requirements for the site note that there is the potential for additional or replacement community facilities and retail units on site as part of the development scheme.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The site is also in close proximity to public transport. However as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with 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.	
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Accidents occur at the junctions. Parking for schools is a problem.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	Building works would cause noise, disruption and pollution, with particular concern for the local school pupils. Local roads would not cope with lorries for building works.	None stated.	<p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm in the form of light and noise pollution.</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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
881	Elizabeth	Pearce	UA28	Understands improvements to Ash Road shops which are currently not fit for purpose. Residents have to cross Egley Road which is unsafe or drive to other town centres.	None stated.	Noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	Would destroy wildlife.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	<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</p>	No further modification is 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>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> <p>The Council notes the proposed modification. The Council's overall approach to Green Belt development has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p>	
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	Housing development would result in the loss of the character of the area.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	Area used for leisure purposes and by wildlife.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Local road has no pavements in areas and is busy making unsuitable for small children.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	<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 footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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 Council note the proposed modification. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. In order to meet this housing need, the Council has had to review 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's Green Belt. This has been set out in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	Woking has little green space left, it is upsetting to see this area under threat.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	<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> <p>The Council note the proposed modification. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. in order to meet this housing need, the Council has had to review the Borough's Green Belt. This has been set out in further detail 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
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Local road has no pavements in areas and is busy making unsuitable for small children.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	<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 footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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 Council note the proposed modification. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. in order to meet this housing need, the Council has had to review the Borough's Green Belt. This has been set out in further detail 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
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	Provides space between Mayford and Hook Heath.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	<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 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 as well as clearly noted in the Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study.</p> <p>The Council note the proposed modification. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. in order to meet this housing need, the Council has had to review 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's Green Belt. This has been set out in further detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.	
894	Katie	Perryman	GB11	Residents use this area as a safe area to walk.	This area should not be used for housing and the Green Belt status should not be taken away.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.</p> <p>In addition, the key requirements for the site state that any development will be required to safeguard public rights of way through the site, retain existing footpaths and improve connectivity to recreation space.</p> <p>The Council note the proposed modification. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. In order to meet this housing need, the Council has had to review the Borough's Green Belt. This has been set out in further detail 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
944	Dorothy	Peakall	UA28	30ft gardens are not sufficient as all properties will be overlooked.	None stated.	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 with adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of overlooking and privacy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
944	Dorothy	Peakall	UA28	Schools are at capacity and new development will bring more families which will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
944	Dorothy	Peakall	UA28	The road network is at capacity and development of a school and this proposal 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
944	Dorothy	Peakall	UA28	Will cause loss to the environment, affecting wildlife.	None stated.	<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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.	
944	Dorothy	Peakall	UA28	Access for the estate is not sufficient. Additional dwellings will cause overcrowding and loss of privacy.	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>As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access to ensure highway safety. The key requirements also note that major highway improvements are likely to be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>With regards to representation regarding overcrowding and loss of privacy, there are robust Development Plan policies (e.g. CS21) 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
981	Colin	Parnell	GB12	Object to development proposals on the Green Belt. The community want Pyrford to remain a village. Appreciate the quietness of surrounding countryside. Additional development will put a strain on village infrastructure and services.	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 representation regarding infrastructure and community services has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
981	Colin	Parnell	GB13	Object to development proposals on the Green Belt. The community want Pyrford to remain a village. Appreciate the quietness of surrounding countryside. Additional development will put a strain on village infrastructure and services.	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 representation regarding infrastructure and community services has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
981	Colin	Parnell	GB12	Historic buildings and CAs would be threatened. Wildlife would be threatened. Will negatively affect the rural feel of the village due to the scale of development. Brownfield sites should be developed on.	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the DPD will have significant adverse impacts on the heritage assets of the area. This is confirmed by the evidence in the SA Report. The Core Strategy (Policy SC20) and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD (Policy DM20) has robust policies to conserve the heritage assets of the area as a result of development impacts. Historic England has also confirmed that they are satisfied that the relationship of the Site Allocations DPD to the policies of the Woking Core Strategy will ensure that development takes place in a sustainable form that reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and by definition, this includes the objective to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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 representation regarding brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p>	
981	Colin	Parnell	GB13	<p>Historic buildings and CAs would be threatened. Wildlife would be threatened. Will negatively affect the rural feel of the village due to the scale of development. Brownfield sites should be developed on.</p>	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the DPD will have significant adverse impacts on the heritage assets of the area. This is confirmed by the evidence in the SA Report. The Core Strategy (Policy SC20) and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD (Policy DM20) has robust policies to conserve the heritage assets of the area as a result of development impacts. Historic England has also confirmed that they are satisfied that the relationship of the Site Allocations DPD to the policies of the Woking Core Strategy will ensure that development takes place in a sustainable form that reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and by definition, this includes the objective to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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 representation regarding brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB4	<p>A petition with 2,500 names objecting to the loss of the Green Belt and due to the level of objection the Council should reconsider building on the Green Belt.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
983	J	Pridden	GB5	A petition with 2,500 names objecting to the loss of the Green Belt and due to the level of objection the Council should reconsider building on the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB4	Flood plains in Byfleet have been built on and any further development will increase the flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB5	Flood plains in Byfleet have been built on and any further development will increase the flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB4	Nearly all the Green Belt in Byfleet is proposed for development however 98% of the Borough remains unaffected.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB5	Nearly all the Green Belt in Byfleet is proposed for development however 98% of the Borough remains unaffected.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB4	The infrastructure is already at capacity due to development.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB5	The infrastructure is already at capacity due to development.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
983	J	Pridden	GB4	There is only one route out of Byfleet and it is already at capacity and further development will make the situation work.	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
						<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>	
983	J	Pridden	GB5	There is only one route out of Byfleet and it is already at capacity and further development will make the situation work.	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
983	J	Pridden	General	Object to development on the Green Belt. There has not been enough consideration or consultation of development. Brownfield sites should be used first.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and the assessment of brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the lack of consultation has been addressed 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
983	J	Pridden	GB4	Object to development on the Green Belt. There has not been enough consideration or consultation of development. Brownfield sites should be used first.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and the assessment of brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the lack of consultation has been addressed 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
983	J	Pridden	GB5	Object to development on the Green Belt. There has not been enough consideration or consultation of development. Brownfield sites should be used first.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and the assessment of brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the lack of consultation has been addressed 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
990	Kenneth	Pearce	GB15	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Consideration should be given to providing a more direct route from Woking to the A3 to ease the load on the A245.	Consideration should be given to providing a more direct route from Woking to the A3 to ease the load on the A245.	<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
990	Kenneth	Pearce	GB15	Object to development on the site as it will result in the loss of a major part of West Byfleet's Green Belt.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
990	Kenneth	Pearce	GB16	Do not object to the development of this site in principle but an infrastructure assessment should be undertaken before the plans are approved, in particular a traffic assessment of the A245 which is already at capacity.	None stated.	<p>The Broadoaks site is allocated for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process and in accordance with existing Development Plan policies.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
990	Kenneth	Pearce	GB15	Local infrastructure including schools, GPs, drainage, sewage and other utilities could be overwhelmed by additional development. This should be investigated and findings publicised before site planning commences.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB12	It is important to maintain the small village character of Pyrford. The landscape and views are important contributors to this.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB13	It is important to maintain the small village character of Pyrford. The landscape and views are important contributors to this.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS21, CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB12	Queries if smaller developments could be used for aging population to release more housing stock.	None stated.	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
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB13	Queries if smaller developments could be used for aging population to release more housing stock.	None stated.	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
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB12	Public transport is poor.	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
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB13	Public transport is poor.	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
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB12	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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.	
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB13	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB12	Infrastructure works to service new homes will cause upheaval.	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB13	Infrastructure works to service new homes will cause upheaval.	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB12	Questions why the Council have departed from the independent advice 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
1041	Jo	Pilgrim	GB13	Questions why the Council have departed from the independent advice 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
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB12	Object to Green Belt development in Pyrford. The character of Pyrford would be lost by removing the clear barrier between the village and countryside.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						landscape features	
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB13	Object to Green Belt development in Pyrford. The character of Pyrford would be lost by removing the clear barrier between the village and countryside.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB12	Development at Pyrford should be looked at in context with all other proposed development sites in the areas, including Wisley and West Byfleet as their impacts will multiple the pressure on local facilities.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure 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>Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council will have to work with neighbouring authorities to explore cross boundary issues and whether the unmet need can be met in their areas. The Council will continue to involve them at all the key stages of the process. A Duty to Cooperate statement and a Consultation Statement will be published in due course</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB13	Development at Pyrford should be looked at in context with all other proposed development sites in the areas, including Wisley and West Byfleet as their impacts will multiple the pressure on local facilities.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure 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>Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council will have to work with neighbouring authorities to explore cross boundary issues and whether the unmet need can be met in their areas. The Council will continue to involve them at all the key stages of the process. A Duty to Cooperate statement and a Consultation Statement will be published in due course</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB12	Will lead to a loss of habitat. The area is full of mammals and a range of birds. The habitat has already been degraded by development over recent years.	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
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB13	Will lead to a loss of habitat. The area is full of mammals and a range of birds. The habitat has already been degraded by development over recent years.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB12	The local infrastructure, including roads, schools, medical facilities and retail, are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Questions how and when will facilities be provided to accommodate new development.	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 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1044	Linda	Piercy	GB13	The local infrastructure, including roads, schools, medical facilities and retail, are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Questions how and when will facilities be provided to accommodate new development.	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 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1112	Sarah	Price	GB13	I understand the Green Belt Review did not consider these sites suitable for release. Why has this been ignored? I hope the Council shows due consideration to the level of opposition demonstrated by local residents.	None stated.	The Green Belt review was a comprehensive assessment of all relevant land parcels in the Green Belt. No site was ignored. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1112	Sarah	Price	GB12	I understand the Green Belt Review did not consider these sites suitable for release. Why has this been ignored? I hope the Council shows due consideration to the level of opposition demonstrated by local residents.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. 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
1112	Sarah	Price	GB12	I would like to register my opposition to the release of Green Belt land. Pyrford has a distinct village identity and strong sense of community. Extensive development of this scale would adversely affect this and quality of life.	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 used a range of evidence to justify the proposals. This are set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1112	Sarah	Price	GB13	I would like to register my opposition to the release of Green Belt land. Pyrford has a distinct village identity and strong sense of community. Extensive development of this scale would adversely affect this and quality of life.	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
1112	Sarah	Price	GB12	Current infrastructure would not support such an increase. The school is being rebuilt without expansion and is already oversubscribed. It could not cater for the increase, shrinking the catchment more. There is serious traffic congestion at school drop off/pick up times, which would worsen.	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	No further modification is 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 interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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.	
1112	Sarah	Price	GB13	Current infrastructure would not support such an increase. The school is being rebuilt without expansion and is already oversubscribed. It could not cater for the increase, shrinking the catchment more. There is serious traffic congestion at school drop off/pick up times, which would worsen.	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
1112	Sarah	Price	GB12	Upshott Lane is a heavily used, narrow country road. Are there plans to widen it? Changes would encourage more commuters to use this route, worsening congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1112	Sarah	Price	GB13	Upshott Lane is a heavily used, narrow country road. Are there plans to widen it? Changes would encourage more commuters to use this route, worsening congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1114	Geoffrey H	Parsons	GB12	I am concerned as the number of houses proposed simply can not be accommodated. Infrastructure could not possibly cope with at least 500-1000 extra people. The roads barely cope with today's traffic at certain times of the day.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
1114	Geoffrey H	Parsons	GB13	I am concerned as the number of houses proposed simply can not be accommodated. Infrastructure could not possibly cope with at least 500-1000 extra people. The roads barely cope with today's traffic at certain times of the day.	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
1114	Geoffrey H	Parsons	GB12	West Byfleet Health Centre will not manage. Pyrford School is already oversubscribed, how could the school accommodate the additional children?	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The general approach to infrastructure provision, including schools to support development is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1114	Geoffrey H	Parsons	GB13	West Byfleet Health Centre will not manage. Pyrford School is already oversubscribed, how could the school accommodate the additional children?	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
1114	Geoffrey H	Parsons	GB12	Why is Woking Council proposing development on Green Belt land that is currently farmed? I am completely opposed. This will change the character of the village of 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development to 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.	
1114	Geoffrey H	Parsons	GB13	Why is Woking Council proposing development on Green Belt land that is currently farmed? I am completely opposed. This will change the character of the village of 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. It is not expected that the proposals will affect the most versatile agricultural land in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1125	Hannah	Pollard	GB12	Very unrealistic to squeeze so many houses or flats into such a small place and, with development at Wisley and Byfleet, unreasonable for the area. Some of my worries are: Is the hospital in Chertsey to be expanded (waiting time already long) or more walk in centres or doctors surgeries? Will the schools be expanded? Will roads be improved (already grid locked at times)? Will there be proper transport (already very poor)? How long will construction take? (disruption, noise, traffic). Will the utilities cope? (already BT, water pressure problems). Will there be any green areas safe? How are these houses being funded?; we need two more street lamps in our road but there is no funding for them?	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 general approach to infrastructure provision to support the development is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the 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 manner by which the traffic implications of the proposals are assessed is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1125	Hannah	Pollard	GB13	Very unrealistic to squeeze so many houses or flats into such a small place and, with development at Wisley and Byfleet, unreasonable for the area. Some of my worries are: Is the hospital in Chertsey to be expanded (waiting time already long) or more walk in centres or doctors surgeries? Will the schools be expanded? Will roads be improved (already grid locked at times)? Will there be proper transport (already very poor)? How long will construction take? (disruption, noise, traffic). Will the utilities cope? (already BT, water pressure problems). Will there be any green areas safe? How are these houses being funded?; we need two more street lamps in our road but there is no funding for them?	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 general approach to infrastructure provision to support the development is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The manner by which the traffic implications of the proposals are assessed is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1187	Jon	Prentice	General	I am very much against/opposed to development of the Green Belt, which should be protected at all costs. There are plenty of brownfield sites to develop. The proposals for Mayford are concerning, there is limited infrastructure to handle such expansion.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1187	Jon	Prentice	DNSITE	I object to change of use of SHLAAMSG013 Silverly at Pyle Hill, this land has come up numerous times and should continue to be saved as Green Belt. Other residents of Pyle Hill/New Lane have the same viewpoint.	None stated.	Site is not allocated for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1187	Jon	Prentice	DNSITE	I object to SHLAAMSG010 where three pitches for the traveller community are proposed on New Lane. This is not an appropriate use of this land.	None stated.	The Council has assessed and rejected the site as not suitable for allocation (Site/0010/MAYS	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	A number of the criteria are also validation requirements for the submission of a planning application; unnecessary to include these. Request amend to delete references to Travel Plans, detailed Transport Assessment, light pollution wind and visual impacts, noise and air quality, and contamination.	Please see attached representation.	These are key requirements that the Council will require development to meet to be acceptable and should be retained.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	Reference to re-providing the existing conference facility should be deleted. Whilst a future redevelopment may contain this there is no justification for this to be a prerequisite. It could undermine the objective to redevelop and upgrade this underused area.	Please see attached representation.	The re-provision of the facilities is consistent with Core Strategy policy CS16 and CS19. The development proposal that comes forward on the site will need to demonstrate compliance with existing Development Plan policies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	UA18 site is in multiple ownership, reducing likelihood of comprehensive redevelopment. The policy can encourage comprehensive development and confirm the Council will support this through using CPO powers, but it should acknowledge that phased development will also be acceptable. Allocation should encourage inclusion of adjacent opportunity sites (Crown House, multi-storey car park) in proposals. There is a risk the policy could be sterilise the site.	Please see attached representation.	Where it is possible the Council will always encourage the comprehensive redevelopment of sites to maximise the efficient use of land and effective integration of development. At this stage it will be premature to commit to the use of its CPO powers for individual sites. Section 6 of the Core Strategy makes it clear that as a last resort the Council is willing to use its compulsory purchase powers to ensure the delivery of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	The Council should review the heritage status of locally listed building 26 Chertsey Road. Not reviewed since 2000, listing criteria do not taken into account the latest Historic England guidance. This local listing could have an unnecessary impact on redevelopment. Alternatively the allocation should confirm that, in weighing applications that affect the locally listed building, the scale of impact or its loss to facilitate a regeneration scheme will be given considerable weight relative to the limited significance of the heritage asset.	Please see attached representation.	Locally listed buildings are an essential element of the heritage assets of the area that is worth protecting. At the stage there is no specific programme for reviewing the assets but the comments are noted and will be taken into account in the future work programme. The Core Strategy contains a robust policy for the protection of heritage assets and development will have to comply with the policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	The allocation should not prescribe the amount of affordable housing. It should identify this will be assessed in the context of any development proposals and scheme viability.	Please see attached representation.	Policy Cs12 of the Core Strategy sets out a specific requirement for affordable housing provision. The proposal reflects this policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	The DPD refers to the site's potential to yield at least 67 dwellings. The site has considerable potential and could provide a greater number, once the design of any scheme is worked up. Request deletion of this reference.	Please see attached representation.	The anticipated capacities are indicative and each proposal will be considered on their merits.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	The delivery arrangements should acknowledge the site can come forward in the short term. As drafted the allocation could delay the delivery of the site by 11 years. It should instead allow the site to come forward as quickly as possible, in the next 5-10 years.	Please see attached representation.	There is no specific time restriction on the development of Proposal UA18.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	Request amend to read: "The Council will support significant new mixed use development on the site comprising appropriate town centre and other uses including office,	Please see attached representation.	The Council is satisfied that the definition of the proposal and the key requirements to make any development acceptable are reasonable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				residential, retail and leisure facilities. Development will be expected to: Provide good quality design of buildings and spaces in this prominent location; Provide a new gateway to the town centre; and Optimise the development potential of the site”.			
1211	Sarah	Pyne	UA18	<p>Write on behalf of client, McKay Securities Ltd. Our client is generally supportive of the principle of redeveloping the site. It has good potential to contribute to regeneration and enhancement of the Town Centre. However, we qualify this as the draft policy is not sufficiently positive or flexible enough. It risks delaying redevelopment.</p> <p>A number of the criteria are basic elements of good design and should be set out in the DPD policies such as CS21 and CS24; no need to refer to them here. Delete requirements regarding views, storage of waste and recyclable materials, servicing areas, Sustainable Drainage Systems and surface water flooding mitigation.</p>	Please see attached representation.	The support for the proposal is acknowledged. It is not suggested that the detailed key requirements should not be material consideration. Rather, the suggestion is for some of the to put in other documents. The Council takes the view that development should be of high quality standards and the key requirements will help to achieve that. It is not envisaged that these would lead to delays in the delivery of the site if it is finally allocated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1218	J	Pearson	General	All Mayford residents say no to chopping the Green Belt, which is part of our lives (walking dogs, children exploring etc.). I am studying deforestation, which is not environmental and could kill people (well maybe). Trees make it a wonderful place to live with a great atmosphere. Green Belt should be protected for the future.	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
1221	Sandra	Pearce	UA32	The site is within flood zone 2 and has potential to suffer from a breach of the embankment of the Basingstoke Canal- this would cause £5m worth of damage and potential loss of life CS9 states that development should not take place there if there are alternatives.	None stated.	Whilst flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Site Allocation DPD is supported by a Sequential Test which demonstrates that the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1, the small percentage located in Flood Zone 2. The proposed developments on the sites are not considered to be 'highly vulnerable uses'.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1221	Sandra	Pearce	UA32	Proximity to the Basingstoke Canal is a concern. The Canal is an SSSI and important for biodiversity. Protected species including 3-7 species of bats, great crested newts, owls and 20 other species. The mature oak trees provide a vital habitat for many creatures. WBC will need to ensure it is complying with its own targets on safeguarding important areas.	WBC will need to ensure it is complying with its own targets on safeguarding important areas.	<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 the proposed allocation will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. The Key Requirements also require mitigation measures for noise and light pollution particularly along the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and SSSI. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1221	Sandra	Pearce	UA32	Ownership of the recreation ground was passed to WBC with a covenant that it remain for recreational use.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements require compliance with core strategy CS17, which require the enhancement of public open space and that any loss of open space should be justified.</p> <p>The exact nature of these measures and any other detailed matters will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1221	Sandra	Pearce	UA32	The decision to bring forward for development the site was taken before the consultation. The legitimacy of the consultation is questioned	None stated.	<p>The area is identified to be within a Priority Place in the Core Strategy CS5. This identifies the area to benefit from and undergo significant regeneration to contribute to future development needs, in particular housing. The area has been identified for a net addition of 250 houses.</p> <p>The key requirements require compliance with core strategy CS17, which require the enhancement of public open space and that any loss of open space should be justified. It also requires the retention or relocation of the Athletics Track. A comprehensive masterplan should</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						ensure that proposals integrate well with the surrounding area, including improved connectivity between open spaces and footpaths and cycle networks. The exact nature of these measures and any other detailed matters will be addressed at the planning application stage.	
1221	Sandra	Pearce	UA32	Strongly object to the redevelopment of Sheerwater which involves demolishing people's homes, replacing them with more dwellings and reducing the amount of green space. The loss of valued recreational/community facilities will be against sustainability policies	None stated.	The key requirements of the site allocation requires compliance with core strategy CS17, which require the enhancement of public open space and that any loss of open space should be justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1221	Sandra	Pearce	UA32	Defines sustainability as balancing competing economic, social and environmental needs. It is highlighted that sustainability is a corporate commitment. Redevelopment of the site goes against Core Strategy and sustainability objectives. Favouring economic over social and environmental.	None stated.	The allocation of the site is consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS5. The site has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal which has assessed the site against 17 SA objectives. Based on the outcome of this exercise and the other supporting evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1221	Sandra	Pearce	UA32	Appreciate the need for housing but concerned about the reduction in greenspace, threats to biodiversity and increase in traffic. Public transport should be improved, increased and made affordable to minimise the need to use a car	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), there is a significant unmet housing need within the borough that needs to be addressed. Overall, about 13 years supply of land could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. This includes UA32. Future growth to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027 will need to be identified within the Green Belt. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 paragraph 3.7, Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0.</p> <p>Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns, the site is identified to be within a Priority Place in the Core Strategy CS5. This identifies the area to benefit from and undergo significant regeneration to contribute to future development needs, in particular housing.</p> <p>The key requirements require compliance with core strategy CS17, which require the enhancement of public open space and that any loss of open space should be justified. It also requires the retention or relocation of the Athletics Track. A comprehensive masterplan should ensure that proposals integrate well with the surrounding area, including improved connectivity between open spaces and footpaths and cycle networks. The exact nature of these measures and any other detailed matters will be addressed at the planning application stage.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB8	Proposals would have an adverse effect on Mayford's road Infrastructure, making it busier and more dangerous. Roads are already busy and bridges are one lane.	Reconsider plans	<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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB9	Proposals would have an adverse effect on Mayford's road Infrastructure, making it busier and more dangerous. Roads are already busy and bridges are one lane.	Reconsider plans	<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
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB10	Proposals would have an adverse effect on Mayford's road Infrastructure, making it busier and more dangerous. Roads are already busy and bridges are one lane.	Reconsider 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 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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB11	Proposals would have an adverse effect on Mayford's road Infrastructure, making it busier and more dangerous. Roads are already busy and bridges are one lane.	Reconsider 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 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
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB14	Proposals would have an adverse effect on Mayford's road Infrastructure, making it busier and more dangerous. Roads are already busy and bridges are one lane.	Reconsider 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 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
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB8	The proposals will likely increase the number of commuters using Worplesdon station which is already at capacity and difficult to get a seat. The trains will struggle to cope.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport is 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB9	The proposals will likely increase the number of commuters using Worplesdon station which is already at capacity and difficult to get a seat. The trains will struggle to cope.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport is 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB10	The proposals will likely increase the number of commuters using Worplesdon station which is already at capacity and difficult to get a seat. The trains will struggle to cope.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport is 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB11	The proposals will likely increase the number of commuters using Worplesdon station which is already at capacity and difficult to get a seat. The trains will struggle to cope.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport is 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB14	The proposals will likely increase the number of commuters using Worplesdon station which is already at capacity and difficult to get a seat. The trains will struggle to cope.	None stated.	<p>Deficiencies in public transport is 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB8	Proposals would result in the loss of a beautiful area and have a significant impact on the local 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 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
						application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB9	Proposals would result in the loss of a beautiful area and have a significant impact on the local 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 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
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB10	Proposals would result in the loss of a beautiful area and have a significant impact on the local 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 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
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB11	Proposals would result in the loss of a beautiful area and have a significant impact on the local 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 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
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB14	Proposals would result in the loss of a beautiful area and have a significant impact on the local 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 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>	
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB8	<p>Visitors of Mayford who strongly object to proposals in Mayford.</p> <p>Government attaches great weight to the GB as it serves five main purpose which are listed.</p> <p>The proposed development does not take into account the main functions.</p>	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. See also Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB9	<p>Visitors of Mayford who strongly object to proposals in Mayford.</p> <p>Government attaches great weight to the GB as it serves five main purpose which are listed.</p> <p>The proposed development does not take into account the main functions.</p>	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. See also Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB10	<p>Visitors of Mayford who strongly object to proposals in Mayford.</p> <p>Government attaches great weight to the GB as it serves five main purpose which are listed.</p> <p>The proposed development does not take into account the main functions.</p>	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. See also Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB11	<p>Visitors of Mayford who strongly object to proposals in Mayford.</p> <p>Government attaches great weight to the GB as it serves five main purpose which are listed.</p> <p>The proposed development does not take into account the main functions.</p>	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. See also Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1225	Robin, Maxine	Pringle	GB14	<p>Visitors of Mayford who strongly object to proposals in Mayford.</p> <p>Government attaches great weight to the GB as it serves five main purpose which are listed.</p> <p>The proposed development does not take into account the main functions.</p>	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. See also Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	<p>An increase in Traveller pitches on the site will reduce the visual amenity of the area and increase risk to the adjoining SSSI</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	Successive planning inspectors have refused planning permission on the site as it would reduce the openness of the GB	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	Mayford resident. Concerned that proposals will have a negative impact on the semi-rural character distinct from Woking and Guildford	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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB8	Local resident. Concerned that proposals will have a negative impact on the semi-rural character distinct from Woking and Guildford	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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB9	Local resident. Concerned that proposals will have a negative impact on the semi-rural character distinct from Woking and Guildford	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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB10	Local resident. Concerned that proposals will have a negative impact on the semi-rural character distinct from Woking and Guildford	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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB11	Local resident. Concerned that proposals will have a negative impact on the semi-rural character distinct from Woking and Guildford	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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	Mayford does not have the supporting infrastructure to support further residential or industrial growth. Particular concerns are raised about the local road and transport infrastructure. More people will exacerbate traffic problems- particularly with the new Hoe Valley School; and strain the public transport infrastructure. Notes that there are no plans to address existing problems, upgrade any of the roads and railway bridges.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The highway capacity was considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB8	The transport infrastructure can not support further residential or industrial development. The proposals will add a significant amount of additional traffic on already heavily congested roads. The traffic from the proposed residential, school and industrial use will exacerbate traffic problems. There doesn't appear to be any consideration to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure or any solutions to deal with existing traffic. Houses can not be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The highway capacity was considered as part of the assessment of the 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>Notwithstanding this, the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB9	<p>The transport infrastructure can not support further residential or industrial development. The proposals will add a significant amount of additional traffic on already heavily congested roads. The traffic from the proposed residential, school and industrial use will exacerbate traffic problems. There doesn't appear to be any consideration to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure or any solutions to deal with existing traffic. Houses can not be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The highway capacity was considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB10	<p>The transport infrastructure can not support further residential or industrial development. The proposals will add a significant amount of additional traffic on already heavily congested roads. The traffic from the proposed residential, school and industrial use will exacerbate traffic problems. There doesn't appear to be any consideration to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure or any solutions to deal with existing traffic. Houses can not be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The highway capacity was considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council has constructively and positively been working 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
						<p>County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB11	<p>The transport infrastructure can not support further residential or industrial development. The proposals will add a significant amount of additional traffic on already heavily congested roads. The traffic from the proposed residential, school and industrial use will exacerbate traffic problems. There doesn't appear to be any consideration to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure or any solutions to deal with existing traffic. Houses can not be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. The highway capacity was considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	It is important to maintain the clear boundaries between Woking and Mayford. Proposals will increase the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB8	It is important to maintain the clear boundaries between Woking and Mayford. Proposals will increase the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB9	It is important to maintain the clear boundaries between Woking and Mayford. Proposals will increase the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB10	It is important to maintain the clear boundaries between Woking and Mayford. Proposals will increase the likelihood	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of Woking and Guildford merging			of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB11	It is important to maintain the clear boundaries between Woking and Mayford. Proposals will increase the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath).	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	An increase in Traveller pitches will increase risk to wildlife on the adjoining protected Heaths (Smarts Heath/Prey Heath)	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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	Appreciates the need for housing but suggests more imaginative and thoughtful proposals on brownfield sites. Reconsider plans, proposals will have a devastating impact on character of Mayford.	Consider proposals on brownfield sites first	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB8	Mayford resident. Recognises the need for more housing however considers there needs to be more imaginative and thoughtful proposals on brownfield sites that could be explored. It would be a travesty for the unique character of Mayford to subsume to the wider urban space.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB9	Mayford resident. Recognises the need for more housing however considers there needs to be more imaginative and thoughtful proposals on brownfield sites that could be explored. It would be a travesty for the unique character of Mayford to subsume to the wider urban space.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 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
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB10	Mayford resident. Recognises the need for more housing however considers there needs to be more imaginative and thoughtful proposals on brownfield sites that could be explored. It would be a travesty for the unique character of Mayford to	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				subsume to the wider urban space.		an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB11	Mayford resident. Recognises the need for more housing however considers there needs to be more imaginative and thoughtful proposals on brownfield sites that could be explored. It would be a travesty for the unique character of Mayford to subsume to the wider urban space.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0 In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1234	Rachel	Pearson	GB7	Object to proposals, believes that Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough. Therefore Mayford already makes a major contribution towards the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion here which would encroach on the rural character	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
1235	Helen	Parker	GB12	Object to the proposed housing sites on GB in Pyrford. Development will set a dangerous precedent for further development in GB. Consider brownfield sites to meet the housing need	Consider proposals on brownfield sites to meet the housing need	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1235	Helen	Parker	GB13	Object to the proposed housing sites on GB in Pyrford. Development will set a dangerous precedent for further development in GB. Consider brownfield sites to meet the housing need	Consider proposals on brownfield sites to meet the housing need	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1235	Helen	Parker	GB12	Local infrastructure and roads are already stretched and proposals will add pressure to stretched resources	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 Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1235	Helen	Parker	GB13	Local infrastructure and roads are already stretched and proposals will add pressure to stretched resources	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>	
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB4	Object to proposals on environmental grounds. Is disappointed with the councils proposals	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
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB5	Object to proposals on environmental grounds. Is disappointed with the councils proposals	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
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB12	Object to proposals on environmental grounds. Is disappointed with the councils proposals	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>	No further modification is 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>	
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB13	Object to proposals on environmental grounds. Is disappointed with the councils proposals	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
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB15	Object to proposals on environmental grounds. Is disappointed with the councils proposals	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
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB16	Object to proposals on environmental grounds. Is disappointed with the councils proposals	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.</p>	No further modification is 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 ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB4	Strongly object. The area around Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford is already heavily congested and road conditions are poor.	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
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB5	Strongly object. The area around Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford is already heavily congested and road conditions are poor.	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
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB12	Strongly object. The area around Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford is already heavily congested and road conditions are poor.	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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>	
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB13	Strongly object. The area around Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford is already heavily congested and road conditions are poor.	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
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB15	Strongly object. The area around Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford is already heavily congested and road conditions are poor.	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>	No further modification is 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>	
1242	Catherine	Pope	GB16	Strongly object. The area around Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford is already heavily congested and road conditions are poor.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1261	Graham	Parrott	General	<p>There has been significant change since the Core Strategy was adopted e.g. revocation of the SE Plan. The GBBR identifies a further 1833 homes between 2022-2040. It is unclear why some of these can not be released from the GB earlier- particularly as the housing target in the Core Strategy is a minimum only.</p> <p>An up to date SHMA indicates that Woking has a housing need of 630 homes per annum. Waverley BC will not be in the position to meet any shortfall arising from Woking's need</p>	Consider releasing identified safeguarded sites before 2027 to meet Woking's objectively assessed identified need.	<p>Contrary to the representation not much has changed regarding strategic planning policy to justify the immediate review of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy was assessed against the requirements of the NPPF and was found sound. Since its adoption, there has not been any significant change in national planning policy to trigger a change in the housing policies of the Core Strategy. The revocation of the South East Plan was well known before the Core strategy was examined. It was considered at the Core Strategy Examination and as such there has not been any material change because of its revocation that has not been previously considered, which would bear on the housing policies of the Core Strategy. The revised SHMA figure of 571 is not significantly different from what was assessed during the Core Strategy Examination. Whilst it is accepted that Waverley and Guildford have made significant progress in the preparation of their local plans, their housing requirement continue to evolve. At this stage there is no adopted housing requirement for any of the two authorities. In this regard, much has not changed since the Core strategy Inspector considered their submissions to the Core Strategy Examination. Overall, none of the above examples either individually or collectively provides sufficient justification to call for the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1261	Graham	Parrott	General	Waverley Borough Council has serious concerns that the draft Site Allocation DPD is not seeking to meet the full housing needs identified in the recent SHMAs: 390-588 new houses per annum between 2011-2031 (Dec 2014), and 630 new homes per annum between 2013-33 (June 2015)	None stated.	<p>The Council welcomes representations from its adjoining authorities, and has engaged with relevant neighbouring authorities, statutory consultees and key stakeholders before and during the consultation period. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the authorities and other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. We will continue to involve them in all the key stages of the process.</p> <p>The Council has prepared an Issues and Matters Topic Paper that addresses all the above issues in detail, and should read in conjunction with this response.</p> <p>The Woking Core Strategy was adopted in October 2012. Its provisions, in particular, the housing requirement was assessed against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and found sound. The housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year was supported by the Inspector against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year. There has not been any change in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and as such its provisions continue to be up to date. The revised SHMA figure of 517 (not 630 as suggested by the representation) is not significantly different from the options that were previously assessed at the Core Strategy stage. There is therefore no justification at this stage to request the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement. The Council's main focus through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD should be towards the delivery of the Core Strategy to effect meaningful changes on the ground. The Core Strategy has its own in-built mechanism for monitoring and review, which will underpin its future review if and when it is necessary to do so. The Site Allocations DPD should not be used as proxy to review the Core Strategy, and indeed would not be appropriate for it to be used as such.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Core Strategy Inspector was supportive of the Council's case that because of the environmental constraints of the area, the historic data on housing delivery and the available evidence the delivery of 594 dwellings per year would not be environmentally sustainable, and indeed could be environmentally damaging. The same analysis is equally relevant to date.</p> <p>The Council is committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy, and the Site Allocations DPD will play a significant role. Instead of the 550 dwellings committed to be delivered from the release of Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027, the draft Site Allocations DPD allocates land to deliver about 817 dwellings within the same period. This will ensure a steady supply of housing land to meet at least the requirement. It is important to note that actual average housing delivery from 2006 to date is about 300 dwellings per year, which is just about the same as the requirement. This average delivery figure covered the period including the economic boom, recession and recent recovery. The housing trajectory for the future indicates that at least the housing requirement will be met.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1261	Graham	Parrott	General	The Site Allocation identifies sites to provide 4964 dwellings by 2027. It also identifies a further 8 sites in the GB to be safeguarded to deliver housing between 2027-2040. The Inspector's Report for WBC Core Strategy stated that "an average housing completion figure of 292 dwellings per annum is reasonable provided it is seen as an average minimum and not an absolute target" (para 83). However, the Site Allocations DPD treats the Core Strategy housing figure as an absolute target and not a minimum.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy Inspector was complementary of the overall spatial strategy of the Core Strategy. He commented that: the Core Strategy provides the most appropriate spatial strategy for sustainable development within the context of the Borough with clear objectives for the plan period in accord with the aims of national planning policy. The spatial strategy focuses most new development on previously developed land in the main urban areas in close proximity to key services and facilities. The Council has identified sufficient urban sites to deliver the housing requirement until 2022. To achieve its sustainability aims, it is important that these sites are delivered before Green Belt land is released for development.</p> <p>The NPPF clearly emphasises the benefit of safeguarding Green Belt land to meet future development needs stretching well beyond the plan period (paragraph 85). This is necessary to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Green Belt boundary review has revealed that apart from the sites that are recommended to be released from the Green Belt for development, no further site could be identified for development without damaging the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It is therefore critical that sites are safeguarded to meet future development needs. The Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses the issue of safeguarding in detail.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1261	Graham	Parrott	General	The Site Allocation does not meet the recently assessed housing need and therefore would result in a shortfall across the housing market.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed above and in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is also important to note that the Core Strategy Inspector took account of the particular circumstances of Waverley Borough Council before agreeing to the housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year. The Inspector's Report is on the website and he makes specific comments about Waverley to demonstrate how he has taken their specific issues into account. Whilst it is accepted that Waverley Borough Council has made significant progress towards the preparation of their local plan, their plan making process continue to evolve and the final decision on what their housing requirement would be has not yet been reached. In 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
						regard, the current position as far as the housing requirement is concerned is no different from when the Core Strategy was examined and adopted.	
1261	Graham	Parrott	General	Waverley Borough Council has serious concerns that the draft Site Allocation DPD is not seeking to meet the full housing needs identified in the recent SHMA. It suggests that Woking brings forward some of the safeguarded sites to meet its objectively assessed needs. Woking Borough Council should consider commencing a review of the CS. Notwithstanding this concern, Waverley BC would like to stress the importance and commitment to continued joint working and liaison between the two boroughs.	Consider a review of the Core Strategy	This has been addressed above. The Council respectfully welcome continued cooperation between the boroughs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1273	Charley	Penny	GB12	Local resident who object to proposals in Pyrford as it will have big impact on the surrounding villages.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that that the DPD is adequately and appropriately informed by robust and up-to-date evidence base (the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0) , and a Sustainability Appraisal. The proposed site allocations also include a list of key requirements that need to be met for sites to come forward. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements make sure that the development of the site are sustainable compared against the reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1273	Charley	Penny	GB13	Local resident who object to proposals in Pyrford as it will have big impact on the surrounding villages.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that that the DPD is adequately and appropriately informed by robust and up-to-date evidence base (the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0) , and a Sustainability Appraisal. The proposed site allocations also include a list of key requirements that need to be met for sites to come forward. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements make sure that the development of the site are sustainable compared against the reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1273	Charley	Penny	GB12	The proposals will dramatically increase traffic and exacerbate existing problems in the area. There could be an additional 800 cars in the area, plus cars from the proposals at Wisley airfield. The increase in traffic will result in the loss of the quiet, idyllic life currently enjoyed here.	None stated.	The Council has comprehensively explained why some areas of the Green Belt land will be required to be released to meet the housing need for the borough. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Adjoining authorities will be under similar pressures to deliver housing to address the unmet housing need. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council will have to work with neighbouring authorities to explore whether the unmet need can be met in their areas. Additionally, the Council will work constructively and positively with adjoining authorities and key stakeholders to consider cross boundary strategic matters, including the potential cumulative impact of development proposals. This 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
1273	Charley	Penny	GB13	The proposals will dramatically increase traffic and exacerbate existing problems in the area. There could be an additional 800 cars in the area, plus cars from the proposals at Wisley airfield. The increase in traffic will result in the loss of the quiet, idyllic life currently enjoyed here.	None stated.	The Council has comprehensively explained why some areas of the Green Belt land will be required to be released to meet the housing need for the borough. This is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. Adjoining authorities will be under similar pressures to deliver housing to address the unmet housing need. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council will have to work with neighbouring authorities to explore whether the unmet need can be met in their areas. Additionally, the Council will work constructively and positively with adjoining authorities and key stakeholders to consider cross boundary strategic matters, including the potential cumulative impact of development proposals. This 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
1273	Charley	Penny	GB12	Pyrford has a unique character and relatively unspoilt. The removal of the GB will lead to quaint villages like Pyrford merging with bigger towns and becoming the urban sprawl out of London.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1273	Charley	Penny	GB13	Pyrford has a unique character and relatively unspoilt. The removal of the GB will lead to quaint villages like Pyrford merging with bigger towns and becoming the urban sprawl out of London.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1273	Charley	Penny	GB12	The proposals will put further pressure on local infrastructure which is inadequate to support the level of development proposed.	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
1273	Charley	Penny	GB13	The proposals will put further pressure on local infrastructure which is inadequate to support the level of development proposed.	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
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB7	<p>Mayford resident.</p> <p>Objects to an increase of Traveller pitches on the site as considers this will have a negative impact on the area.</p> <p>Concerned about potential anti-social behaviour and a rise in domestic animals which will impact on local amenity and may destroy protected wildlife.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council treats all members of the community equally and has a duty to ensure there is appropriate housing to meet the needs of the whole community.</p> <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
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB8	<p>There are other good schools in the area. The proposed FREE school is not part of SCC Education Strategy therefore unsure why it is needed and who it is being catered for. Is it to accommodate local children, children of the proposed new housing or for children further afield?</p> <p>Additional traffic will be created from children travelling further afield, the roads can not accommodate the traffic as it is.</p> <p>The proposed school, Leisure Centre and running track will appeal to a wide catchment and draw in additional traffic, noise, light pollution.</p> <p>The proposal is not acceptable within the GB and may be contrary to Government guidelines.</p>	None stated.	<p>The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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.</p> <p>See also paragraph 3.8 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB10	<p>The land around Saunders Lane is low lying and susceptible to flooding.</p> <p>The area is important for local wildlife and various species have been spotted on the site including Deer, Badgers, Foxes and Bats.</p> <p>Suspects corruption in the Council for certain sites being considered</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and Section 6.0. The Council is confident that it has been clear and transparent in preparing the DPD. The available evidence (Section 8.0) demonstrates that the preferred sites identified in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against other alternative sites.</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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB11	<p>The land around Saunders Lane is low lying and susceptible to flooding.</p> <p>The area is important for local wildlife and various species have been spotted on the site including Deer, Badgers, Foxes and Bats.</p> <p>Suspects corruption in the Council for certain sites being considered</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and Section 6.0. The Council is confident that it has been clear and transparent in preparing the DPD. The available evidence (Section 8.0) demonstrates that the preferred sites identified in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against other alternative sites.</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
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB10	<p>There is insufficient infrastructure to support the additional growth in the area. Proposals could result in another 1000 cars on already congested roads.</p> <p>Understands that there has been no formal traffic impact study undertaken by the Environment Agency. The only study available uses a computerised model that suggests you can travel from Mayford to Woking in 9 minutes- this is not accurate.</p> <p>As a local resident, observations about the local road network, these should be taken into account.</p>	<p>A traffic impact study should be undertaken.</p> <p>Consider the numerous observations about the local road network (see original rep)</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 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
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB11	<p>There is insufficient infrastructure to support the additional growth in the area. Proposals could result in another 1000 cars on already congested roads.</p> <p>Understands that there has been no formal traffic impact study undertaken by the Environment Agency. The only study available uses a computerised model that suggests you can travel from Mayford to Woking in 9 minutes- this is not accurate.</p> <p>As a local resident, observations about the local road network, these should be taken into account.</p>	<p>A traffic impact study should be undertaken.</p> <p>Consider the numerous observations about the local road network (see original rep)</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 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>	No further modification is 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.	
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB10	Lists the services and facilities available in Mayford. In summary, the rep is highlighting inadequate local infrastructure in Mayford to support the proposals	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. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1278	Richard G	Pearson	GB11	Lists the services and facilities available in Mayford. In summary, the rep is highlighting inadequate local infrastructure in Mayford to support the proposals	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. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1279	Patrick	Prince	General	There is a general objection for development in the GB in Byfleet from its residents. Suggests that residents in the area should receive a reduction in their Council tax as a result.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. There is no proposal to reduce council tax in areas where sites have been identified for to meet future development needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB4	The GB was established to restrict development and preserve area as pleasant areas to live. Byfleet has seen a steady increase in traffic over the years, where some roads are unusable at peak hours.	None stated.	With regards to the release of GB land for future development, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be	No further modification is 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>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>	
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB5	The GB was established to restrict development and preserve area as pleasant areas to live. Byfleet has seen a steady increase in traffic over the years, where some roads are unusable at peak hours.	None stated.	<p>With regards to the release of GB land for future development, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB4	WBC appear to be conceding to the preferences of developers to build on greenfield land over brownfield land. The decisions seem to be weighted towards achieving maximum profit with no regard for the impact on local environment or its residents.	None stated.	The representation regarding the process of identification sites to meet the development need has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and Section 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB5	WBC appear to be conceding to the preferences of developers to build on greenfield land over brownfield land. The decisions seem to be weighted towards achieving maximum profit with no regard for the impact on local environment or its residents.	None stated.	The representation regarding the process of identification sites to meet the development need has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and Section 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB4	The proposals are likely to be "gated" schemes, unlikely to contribute much to the local community. The proposals will only place a burden on existing services/facilities e.g. schools and 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</p>	No further modification is 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 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>	
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB5	The proposals are likely to be "gated" schemes, unlikely to contribute much to the local community. The proposals will only place a burden on existing services/facilities e.g. schools and 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
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB4	An additional 1293 homes will add approximately 2400 additional cars onto the roads. This could cause or exacerbate existing health problems of residents through the increase in pollution.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment or harm to local amenity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB5	An additional 1293 homes will add approximately 2400 additional cars onto the roads. This could cause or exacerbate existing health problems of residents through the increase in pollution.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment or harm to local amenity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB4	The existing traffic already causes considerable pollution and black smoke. Short journeys can take hours. Adding 4000 more vehicles is ridiculous and unacceptable. Object to further development along Parvis Road	None stated.	<p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting 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> <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
1279	Patrick	Prince	GB5	The existing traffic already causes considerable pollution and black smoke. Short journeys can take hours. Adding 4000 more vehicles is ridiculous and unacceptable. Object to further development along Parvis Road	None stated.	<p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting 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> <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</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
1289	Phil	Potter	GB4	<p>The A245 is a highly congested road. It is a single lane carriageway which is the main route for commuters between Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford and the A3. At its worst traffic stretches between the Weybridge Tesco roundabout up to the A3.</p> <p>The traffic is not limited to peak commuting times but during other periods too.</p> <p>Other roads in the area are in poor condition. Godley Road and High Road have been resurfaced- more roads should receive similar treatment.</p> <p>An increase in population will increase car use and exacerbate traffic.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1289	Phil	Potter	GB5	<p>The A245 is a highly congested road. It is a single lane carriageway which is the main route for commuters between Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford and the A3. At its worst traffic stretches between the Weybridge Tesco roundabout up to the A3.</p> <p>The traffic is not limited to peak commuting times but during other periods too.</p> <p>Other roads in the area are in poor condition. Godley Road and High Road have been resurfaced- more roads should receive similar treatment.</p> <p>An increase in population will increase car use and exacerbate traffic.</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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1289	Phil	Potter	GB4	The area was flooded in 2013 and continues to experience surface water flooding during high rainfall. Adding more homes in the GB increases the risk of flooding further.	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
1289	Phil	Potter	GB5	The area was flooded in 2013 and continues to experience surface water flooding during high rainfall. Adding more homes in the GB increases the risk of flooding further.	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
1301	Craig	Pettit	General	Representation seeking to put forward land at Tulip Trees, and neighbouring Ascan Croft, Woking (as shown on the enclosed red line location plan). The site is located within the GB but adjacent to the urban area. The CS accepts that not all the housing need can be met within the urban area and some development will need to be located within the GB.	None stated.	The Council has considered the site as part of parcel 30 of the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). With regards to the assessment against Green Belt purposes, Parcel 30 was considered to provide local containment and was also noted that there were various designations (Common Land, conservation area and SNCI), that were considered to be absolute constraints to development. The Parcel was considered to have little to no capacity for change. It is almost entirely woodland with two open areas providing recreation grounds/playing fields. The area generally has a distinctive sense of place and is highly sensitive to change. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 27.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1301	Craig	Pettit	General	The sites have good access to key local services, community facilities and public transport.	None stated.	This representation provides supporting information to allocate the site Tulip Trees, however the site was already considered as part of a parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review which concludes that the parcel has little to no capacity for change.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1301	Craig	Pettit	General	The GBBR recommends that Parcel 30 is removed from the Green Belt to rationalise and create a robust edge. However, the document does not propose its release from the Green Belt for development purposes. This is most likely because part of the area is covered other designations which prevent development e.g. SNCI. However, Woking Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) Summary Report (December 2005) states that, in relation to the St Johns Lye and Ponds SNCI, "The conservation value of the site has declined" The designation would prevent the unrestricted sprawl of development, should the Green Belt designation for this area be removed.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed above. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1301	Craig	Pettit	General	The new sites would allow for the appropriate setting for development with generous amenity space. The amenity space could provide enhancement to the nearby SNCI	None stated.	This representation provides supporting information to allocate the site Tulip Trees, however the site was already considered as part of a parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review which concludes that the parcel has little to no capacity for change.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1301	Craig	Pettit	General	The SHMA states that although the market for care homes is not 'in need', that approximately 23.9% of the market will inevitably require extra care in the future. The sites are sustainable and available and would make a positive contribution to the housing need in the borough	None stated.	This representation provides supporting information to allocate the site Tulip Trees, however the site was already considered as part of a parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review which concludes that the parcel has little to no capacity for change. The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1301	Craig	Pettit	General	It is accepted that not all of Parcel 30 is appropriate for development however it is considered that the railway line to the south provides a natural and sensible boundary. The areas of the parcel unsuitable would already be	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed above. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0 and 17.0 The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision 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
				protected by other designations, whereas the land that is suitable would make a valued contribution to housing provision. Small scale residential or specialist care development could be achieved on the two sites (subject of this representation), whilst respecting the surrounding natural habitats.		borough. 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.	
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	GB is protected by statute for the purpose of allowing the preservation of green spaces and limiting the growth of one community into another	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9, and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	GB is protected by statute for the purpose of allowing the preservation of green spaces and limiting the growth of one community into another	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9, and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	GB is protected by statute for the purpose of allowing the preservation of green spaces and limiting the growth of one community into another	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9, and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	GB is protected by statute for the purpose of allowing the preservation of green spaces and limiting the growth of one community into another	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly 1.9, and 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	The proposals will result in a the loss of community. Also concerned about the serious impact on traffic and infrastructure to support the significant increase in housing proposed for Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford area. The current utility infrastructure is at capacity. The area will not cope. The proposals need to be supported with significant investment towards local infrastructure including roads, public transport, utilities, schools, healthcare provision and retail.	None stated.	Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable. 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 With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	The proposals will result in a the loss of community. Also concerned about the serious impact on traffic and infrastructure to support the significant increase in housing proposed for Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford area. The current utility infrastructure is at capacity. The area will not cope. The proposals need to be supported with significant investment towards local infrastructure including roads, public transport, utilities, schools, healthcare provision and retail.	None stated.	Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable. 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 With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	The proposals will result in a the loss of community. Also concerned about the serious impact on traffic and infrastructure to support the significant increase in housing proposed for Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford area. The current utility infrastructure is at capacity. The area will not cope. The proposals need to be supported with significant	None stated.	Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				investment towards local infrastructure including roads, public transport, utilities, schools, healthcare provision and retail.		<p>With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage</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>	
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	<p>The proposals will result in a the loss of community. Also concerned about the serious impact on traffic and infrastructure to support the significant increase in housing proposed for Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford area. The current utility infrastructure is at capacity. The area will not cope.</p> <p>The proposals need to be supported with significant investment towards local infrastructure including roads, public transport, utilities, schools, healthcare provision and retail.</p>	None stated.	<p>Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable.</p> <p>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>With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage</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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	There is insufficient school provision. Primary schools are at capacity and many secondary school children have to travel outside the area.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	There is insufficient school provision. Primary schools are at capacity and many secondary school children have to travel outside the area.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	There is insufficient school provision. Primary schools are at capacity and many secondary school children have to travel outside the area.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	There is insufficient school provision. Primary schools are at capacity and many secondary school children have to travel outside the area.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	Object to proposals for the release of GB land in Pyrford, Byfleet, West Byfleet. WBC have inadequately considered the additional strain on existing and planned infrastructure that developments of this size will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on</p>	No further modification is 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 Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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>	
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	Object to proposals for the release of GB land in Pyrford, Byfleet, West Byfleet. WBC have inadequately considered the additional strain on existing and planned infrastructure that developments of this size will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	Object to proposals for the release of GB land in Pyrford, Byfleet, West Byfleet. WBC have inadequately considered the additional strain on existing and planned infrastructure that developments of this size will cause.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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
						<p>to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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>	
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	Object to proposals for the release of GB land in Pyrford, Byfleet, West Byfleet. WBC have inadequately considered the additional strain on existing and planned infrastructure that developments of this size will cause.	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 adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	The Health Centre is at capacity and appointments are hard to obtain. Access and Parking also a concern.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	The Health Centre is at capacity and appointments are hard to obtain. Access and Parking also a concern.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	The Health Centre is at capacity and appointments are hard to obtain. Access and Parking also a concern.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	The Health Centre is at capacity and appointments are hard to obtain. Access and Parking also a concern.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	These are key areas of accessible green space enjoyed by local residents for leisure and recreation. There are few areas which are accessible without needing to drive there.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	These are key areas of accessible green space enjoyed by local residents for leisure and recreation. There are few areas which are accessible without needing to drive there.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	These are key areas of accessible green space enjoyed by local residents for leisure and recreation. There are few areas which are accessible without needing to drive there.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	These are key areas of accessible green space enjoyed by local residents for leisure and recreation. There are few areas which are accessible without needing to drive there.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	West Byfleet requires long term strategic thinking. The buildings in the vicinity of the library are unattractive and not fit for purpose. The local Waitrose is at capacity. No consideration given to developing a long term strategic view for the area.	None stated.	Land at Station Approach West Byfleet is being proposed for allocation, for mixed used development. The proposal is for the comprehensive redevelopment of the area to maximise the opportunities to enhance the centre of West Byfleet. Please see the proposed allocation under the site reference UA51	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	West Byfleet requires long term strategic thinking. The buildings in the vicinity of the library are unattractive and not fit for purpose. The local Waitrose is at capacity. No consideration given to developing a long term strategic view for the area.	None stated.	Land at Station Approach West Byfleet is being proposed for allocation, for mixed used development. The proposal is for the comprehensive redevelopment of the area to maximise the opportunities to enhance the centre of West Byfleet. Please see the proposed allocation under the site reference UA51	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	West Byfleet requires long term strategic thinking. The buildings in the vicinity of the library are unattractive and not fit for purpose. The local Waitrose is at capacity. No consideration given to developing a long term strategic view for the area.	WBC, local retailers and a developer should work together to develop a long term strategy for West Byfleet Centre to improve both sides of Station Approach.	Land at Station Approach West Byfleet is being proposed for allocation, for mixed used development. The proposal is for the comprehensive redevelopment of the area to maximise the opportunities to enhance the centre of West Byfleet. Please see the proposed allocation under the site reference UA51	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	West Byfleet requires long term strategic thinking. The buildings in the vicinity of the library are unattractive and not fit for purpose. The local Waitrose is at capacity. No consideration given to developing a long term strategic view for the area.	None stated.	Land at Station Approach West Byfleet is being proposed for allocation, for mixed used development. The proposal is for the comprehensive redevelopment of the area to maximise the opportunities to enhance the centre of West Byfleet. Please see the proposed allocation under the site reference UA51	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	WBC have not fully considered the issues with bringing forward housing sites in the GB including siting, access and infrastructure provision	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> <p>With regards to utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage</p>	
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	WBC have not fully considered the issues with bringing forward housing sites in the GB including siting, access and infrastructure provision	Further consideration required on site specifics and infrastructure provision	<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 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 utilities please see Section 3.0 paragraph 3.9,3.10. The Council will continue engage with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	WBC have not fully considered the issues with bringing forward housing sites in the GB including siting, access and infrastructure provision	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	WBC have not fully considered the issues with bringing forward housing sites in the GB including siting, access and infrastructure provision	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	Proposals at West Hall and Broadoaks will be accessed from Parvis Road (A245)- which is already frequently congested. Short five minute journeys can take over 40 minutes. And consider emergency vehicles which have to negotiate traffic. If development goes ahead without provision for an additional bypass or dual carriageway the traffic will increase dramatically and therefore increasing pollution and affecting the health of local residents. Traffic will also have an impact on the appeal of the area for employers and businesses.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	Proposals at West Hall and Broadoaks will be accessed from Parvis Road (A245)- which is already frequently congested. Short five minute journeys can take over 40 minutes. And consider emergency vehicles which have to negotiate traffic. If development goes ahead without provision for an additional bypass or dual carriageway the traffic will increase dramatically and therefore increasing pollution and affecting the health of local residents. Traffic will also have an impact on the appeal of the area for employers and businesses.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	Proposals at West Hall and Broadoaks will be accessed from Parvis Road (A245)- which is already frequently congested. Short five minute journeys can take over 40 minutes. And consider emergency vehicles which have to negotiate traffic. If development goes ahead without provision for an additional bypass or dual carriageway the traffic will increase dramatically and therefore increasing pollution and affecting	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</p>	No further modification is 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 health of local residents. Traffic will also have an impact on the appeal of the area for employers and businesses.		<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 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>	
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	Proposals at West Hall and Broadoaks will be accessed from Parvis Road (A245)- which is already frequently congested. Short five minute journeys can take over 40 minutes. And consider emergency vehicles which have to negotiate traffic. If development goes ahead without provision for an additional bypass or dual carriageway the traffic will increase dramatically and therefore increasing pollution and affecting the health of local residents. Traffic will also have an impact on the appeal of the area for employers and businesses.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	Concerned of the lack of health provision and schooling for families and residents if proposals go ahead. Expansion should be at a sustainable level.	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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	Concerned of the lack of health provision and schooling for families and residents if proposals go ahead. Expansion should be at a sustainable level.	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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	Concerned of the lack of health provision and schooling for families and residents if proposals go ahead. Expansion should be at a sustainable level.	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, 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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	Concerned of the lack of health provision and schooling for families and residents if proposals go ahead. Expansion should be at a sustainable level.	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, 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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB12	WBC need to offer solutions to the lack of infrastructure provision or the area will not cope with the proposed increase in dwellings/population.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB13	WBC need to offer solutions to the lack of infrastructure provision or the area will not cope with the proposed increase in dwellings/population.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB4	WBC need to offer solutions to the lack of infrastructure provision or the area will not cope with the proposed increase in dwellings/population.	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
1314	Laura	Plastow	GB5	WBC need to offer solutions to the lack of infrastructure provision or the area will not cope with the proposed increase in dwellings/population.	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
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB7	Concerned that an increase in Traveller pitches will impact the adjacent Heathland. Proposals will reduce the visual amenity and unspoilt natural beauty of the area. Objects to heathland being taken out of recreational/environmental use. It should be safeguarded for local biodiversity and for the health/wellbeing of local people. Would support the incorporation of the Heaths to the protected TBH SPA.	Incorporate the Heaths to TBH SPA	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 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
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB10	Development proposals should be sympathetically designed and incorporate sustainable design/construction elements	None stated.	Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy, including CS17, CS21, CS22, Design SPD and the Climate Change SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB8	Mayford resident, concerned about the loss of village identity, although appreciates that a green corridor will be maintained along A320 and GB14. Suggests the retention of mature trees/hedgerows and	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 5.0 and 21.0 The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				natural planting e.g. wildflower to soften built development and encourage biodiversity. Considers there is the opportunity for an ecodevelopment in the area- incorporating sustainable construction techniques/materials solar roofing tiles, Su, permeable driveways etc. Concerned of increased flooding risk along A320 and therefore would want to see these safeguarded land for floodplain and amenity use on the other side of the A320.		Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.	
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB11	The fields are well used and are valued local amenity land. These should be retained. Questions whether building on the escarpment is wise, it could increase the risk of flooding. Permeable driveways and similar measures should be incorporated in schemes to reduce flood risk and provide corridors for wildlife to move around.	Permeable driveways and similar measures should be incorporated in schemes to reduce flood risk and provide corridors for wildlife to move around.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly paragraph 5.5 and also see Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB8	Ensure sustainable construction techniques/standard are applied- e.g. on site energy production. Proposals should be sympathetically designed to be as green as possible	None stated.	Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy CS22 and the Climate Change SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB7	Objects to the associated business use which may create noise pollution and increased traffic. There is already light industrial use in several places around Mayford, another area is not necessary.	None stated.	The Council treats all members of the community equally and has a duty to ensure there is appropriate housing to meet the needs of the whole community. The Council does not condone or agree with the comments made. With respect to the representation regarding business use this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0 paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB8	Concern raised regarding the capacity of Barnsbury Primary School and its future should proposals go ahead. Concerned about the extra traffic that will be created, pedestrian crossing and pavement widening should be incorporated to ensure road safety.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area. The representation regarding schools has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB7	Concerned that the proposals will intensify the use of the site by fivefold (12 additional pitches to the existing 3). Concerned about flooding issues, the potential cost of raising units to a level that is safe from flooding and also the potential increase of flood risk as a result of proposals. Concerned that Traveller pitches will threaten ecology and local wildlife particularly in the adjoining SSSI	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the 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>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
1321	Katharine	Parsons	General	Support the inclusion of Smarts and Prey Heaths into TBH SPA. Overdevelopment of Ten Acre Farm will inadvertently affect the character of the heaths.	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
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB9	<p>Questions whether Wyevale will remain or be redeveloped? A new café would be supported if Wyevale was lost. A new convenience store would not be supported as it would be in competition with the existing post office.</p> <p>Concern is also raised regarding traffic and a dangerous access point to Wyevale.</p>	None stated.	<p>Detailed matters will be addressed during the planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB10	<p>Main concern is the level of traffic that will be created. The local roads and bridges are inadequate to cope with the increase.</p> <p>Road safety is also a concern</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, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Saunders Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB10	Suggests that the density of GB10 and GB11 be reduced	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB11	Suggests that the density of GB10 and GB11 be reduced	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1321	Katharine	Parsons	GB7	<p>Suggests that less pitches are considered and if there is too much opposition then it should not be implemented. Proposals should be designed sympathetically and sustainably, with top ecocredentials and blend in with the environment.</p> <p>Adjacent green areas to be retained and managed for future generations. Suggest a green buffer along the river corridor for safety reason and increased biodiversity.</p>	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB14	For the Site Allocation to be found sound it needs to be supported by a rigorous SA to confirm appropriate assessed reasonable alternatives.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 8.0 and 9.0.	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 NPPG defines 'reasonable alternatives'. It is argued that not all reasonable alternatives have been tested e.g. the Council should have tested the option of safeguarding sites versus comprehensive release of all the sites within the plan period to assess the sustainability merits of both. The decision to safeguard land has been taken outside of the SA process.</p> <p>In addition the SA does not provide supporting evidence to justify why sites have been selected ahead of others (see paragraph 20.5). Therefore the overarching strategy set out in the plan is fundamentally unsound as it fails the justified and effective NPPF tests as well as contrary to the SA / SEA regulations.</p>		<p>Woking Borough Council has committed to prepare a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) to enable the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Woking Core Strategy (2012). The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings between 2010 and 2027. The Core Strategy has its own in-built mechanism for monitoring and review, which will underpin its future review if and when it is necessary to do so. The Site Allocations DPD should not be used as proxy to review the Core Strategy.</p>	
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB8	<p>Recommends that GB14 can deliver housing as well as GI. The housing element will provide sufficient value to ensure the GI element will be delivered.</p> <p>Recommends that reference to the equalisation agreement must be a fundamental component of GB8, GB10 and GB11. The wording in these policies must therefore be amended to make explicitly clear that the green infrastructure proposed for GB14 - Land Adjacent to Hook Hill Lane is essential to serve residential development on GB8, GB10 and GB11. The reference to the equalisation agreement between the landowners of GB8, GB10, GB11 and GB14 must then require that the proposed residential development on each site cannot be brought forward until the agreement is in place such is the importance of ensuring lands south of Woking can be developed collaboratively and comprehensively</p>	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Green Belt boundary review, this site is located at the higher point on the Escarpment of rising land. For this reason the site is not considered suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Due to the need to provide a better integration of green infrastructure to maintain the rural character of the area the evidence provided in the Green Belt boundary review has emphasised the need for GB14 to be planned as a green infrastructure site to serve sites GB8, GB10 and GB11. Consequently the way these sites, which has different land ownership, plan to integrate and make accessible this necessary infrastructure an equalisation agreement and or any other means of arrangement that will ensure effective integration and access to this infrastructure will be required. By already highlighting this within the key requirements for the sites, the Council do not believe it is necessary to emphasise this point further at this stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB10	<p>Recommends that GB14 can deliver housing as well as GI. The housing element will provide sufficient value to ensure the GI element will be delivered.</p> <p>Recommends that reference to the equalisation agreement must be a fundamental component of GB8, GB10 and GB11. The wording in these policies must therefore be amended to make explicitly clear that the green infrastructure proposed for GB14 - Land Adjacent to Hook Hill Lane is essential to serve residential development on GB8, GB10 and GB11. The reference to the equalisation agreement between the landowners of GB8, GB10, GB11 and GB14 must then require that the proposed residential development on each site cannot be brought forward until the agreement is in place such is the importance of ensuring land south of Woking can be developed collaboratively and comprehensively</p>	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Green Belt boundary review, this site is located at the higher point on the Escarpment of rising land. For this reason the site is not considered suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Due to the need to provide a better integration of green infrastructure to maintain the rural character of the area the evidence provided in the Green Belt boundary review has emphasised the need for GB14 to be planned as a green infrastructure site to serve sites GB8, GB10 and GB11. Consequently the way these sites, which has different land ownership, plan to integrate and make accessible this necessary infrastructure an equalisation agreement and or any other means of arrangement that will ensure effective integration and access to this infrastructure will be required. By already highlighting this within the key requirements for the sites, the Council do not believe it is necessary to emphasise this point further at this stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB11	<p>Recommends that GB14 can deliver housing as well as GI. The housing element will provide sufficient value to ensure the GI element will be delivered.</p> <p>Recommends that reference to the equalisation agreement must be a fundamental component of GB8, GB10 and GB11. The wording in these policies must therefore be amended to make explicitly clear that the green infrastructure proposed for GB14 - Land Adjacent to Hook Hill Lane is essential to serve residential development on GB8, GB10 and GB11. The reference to the equalisation agreement between the landowners of GB8, GB10, GB11 and GB14 must then require that the proposed residential development on each site cannot be brought forward until the agreement is in place</p>	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Green Belt boundary review, this site is located at the higher point on the Escarpment of rising land. For this reason the site is not considered suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Due to the need to provide a better integration of green infrastructure to maintain the rural character of the area the evidence provided in the Green Belt boundary review has emphasised the need for GB14 to be planned as a green infrastructure site to serve sites GB8, GB10 and GB11. Consequently the way these sites, which has different land ownership, plan to integrate and make accessible this necessary infrastructure an equalisation agreement and or any other means of arrangement that will ensure effective integration and access to this infrastructure will be required. By already highlighting this within the key requirements for the sites, the Council do not believe it is necessary to emphasise this point further at this 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
				such is the importance of ensuring land south of Woking can be developed collaboratively and comprehensively			
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB14	Questions why the proposed delivery of GB14 is post 2027	None stated.	The representation provides supporting information to allocate GB14 for residential use. This has been comprehensively addressed above. With regards to the approach to housing delivery 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
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB14	Notes the GBBR and the conclusions drawn about the potential impact on the escarpment preventing residential development on the site. Supporting information is submitted in the form of a 'Visioning' document for GB14. This work includes Landscape and Visual Impact of the site and critique of the Green Belt Review, produced by Barton Willmore. The document considers that the landscape sensitivity is equal to other sites being considered in the area and therefore the site can accommodate some housing	Propose GB14 for residential development	The representation provides supporting information to allocate GB14 for residential use. This has been comprehensively addressed above.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	For the Site Allocation to be found sound it needs to be supported by a rigorous SA to confirm appropriate assessed reasonable alternatives. The NPPG defines 'reasonable alternatives'. It is argued that not all reasonable alternatives have been tested e.g. the Council should have tested the option of safeguarding sites versus comprehensive release of all the sites within the plan period to assess the sustainability merits of both. The decision to safeguard land has been taken outside of the SA process. In addition the SA does not provide supporting evidence to justify why sites have been selected ahead of others (see paragraph 20.5). Therefore the overarching strategy set out in the plan is fundamentally unsound as it fails the justified and effective NPPF tests as well as contrary to the SA / SEA regulations.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 8.0 and 9.0. Woking Borough Council has committed to prepare a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) to enable the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Woking Core Strategy (2012). The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings between 2010 and 2027. The Core Strategy has its own in-built mechanism for monitoring and review, which will underpin its future review if and when it is necessary to do so. The Site Allocations DPD should not be used as proxy to review the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	The Core Strategy sets out 4964 net additional homes to be delivered between 2010 and 2027. It should be noted that this is the minimum requirement. Based on figures in the Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement (December 2014) identifies that 964 dwellings (net) have been completed since the start of the plan period, which leaves a minimum 4,000 homes to be delivered to 2027. The Site Allocation DPD does identify just over this. It should be highlighted that the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development means for or plan-making that "Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change" and in respect to Woking's housing requirement this represents the minimum that should be provided. It will only take a few of the identified sites not coming forward for WBC to not meet its housing requirement in the Core Strategy. Therefore, instead of holding back suitable sites until after the 2027, suitable sites should be brought forward. The existing approach does not accord with the NPPF	Safeguarded sites should be brought forward into the existing plan period to meet the OAN	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	Deduces that given the amount of identified brownfield sites suggests there is a significant shortfall. The NPPF requires plans to be flexible and have the ability to plan to respond to rapid change. Concerned that the plan relies on a limited supply of land to deliver the identified need, making the plan inflexible.	None stated.	This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0. The Council is committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy, and the Site Allocations DPD will play a significant role. Instead of the 550 dwellings committed to be delivered from the release of Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027, the draft Site Allocations DPD allocates land to deliver about 817 dwellings	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						within the same period. This will ensure a steady supply of housing land to meet at least the requirement. It is important to note that actual average housing delivery from 2006 to date is about 300 dwellings per year, which is just about the same as the requirement. This average delivery figure covered the period including the economic boom, recession and recent recovery. The housing trajectory for the future indicates that at least the housing requirement will be met.	
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	Objects to the Site Allocation DPD seeking to meet the minimum housing requirement- against evidence and the Inspector's comments. There is no justification to hold back suitable sites from development when there is clear evidence to show that current housing need is higher than the minimum housing requirement. The Council's approach is not justified and therefore will likely fail the tests of soundness	None stated.	This representation has been addressed above. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 and 2.0 and should be read in conjunction with this response.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	Preference for the Site Allocation DPD to be amended to include additional allocations. If the Council proceeds with DPD without making further allocations then it argued that there should be a firm commitment of a review of the Core Strategy within the plan. This can be in the form of a new policy that sets out the timeframe for adopting an updated Core Strategy. As well as putting in place mechanisms that would allow for early release of sites in the event of any shortfall.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed above. Not much has changed regarding strategic planning policy to justify the immediate review of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy was assessed against the requirements of the NPPF and was found sound. Since its adoption, there has not been any significant change in national planning policy to trigger a change in the housing policies of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy has its own in-built mechanism for monitoring and review, which will underpin its future review if and when it is necessary to do so.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB14	Taylor Wimpey have an interest in GB14 and support the release of the site from the GB. However believes that the site can accommodate some element of housing as well as open space/green infrastructure.	Propose GB14 for residential development	The representation provides supporting information to allocate GB14 for residential use. This has been comprehensively addressed above. The site has already been assessed in the Green Belt Boundary Review and a sustainability appraisal undertaken (reference SITE/0035/SJHH, SHLAASJHH035). The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground, therefore it was considered unsuitable for built development . Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure only.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB14	The site was previously recommended for release from the GB in work undertaken for both the Surrey Structure Plan 2002 and South East Plan 2009. The proposed release of the site from the GB is supported however object to the proposal that the site can only deliver green infrastructure. Evidence is submitted that the site can also provide around 100 homes, which would make a significant contribution to the housing requirement. The conclusions drawn from the site assessment are supported by compelling evidence prepared by the representor- including an LVIA, critique of the GBBR, promotional document for GB14.	None stated.	As set out in the Green Belt boundary review, this site is located at the higher point on the Escarpment of rising land. For this reason the site is not considered suitable for residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	The Inspector for the Core Strategy accepted the 292 dpa housing figure in the absence of a GB review and as such did not have evidence to support what the GB could accommodate. The inspector also noted opportunities for joint working with adjoining authorities to help meet the need. The inspector made two fundamental changes to Core Strategy to make it sound. 1 The housing requirement must be expressed as a minimum 2 A Green Belt review be completed asap.	None stated.	The Council is committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy, and the Site Allocations DPD will play a significant role. Instead of the 550 dwellings committed to be delivered from the release of Green Belt land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027, the draft Site Allocations DPD allocates land to deliver about 817 dwellings within the same period. This will ensure a steady supply of housing land to meet at least the requirement. It is important to note that actual average housing delivery from 2006 to date is about 300 dwellings per year, which is just about the same as the requirement. This average delivery figure covered the period including the economic boom, recession and recent recovery. The housing trajectory for the future indicates that at least the housing requirement will be met. The NPPF clearly emphasises the benefit of safeguarding Green Belt land to meet future	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Overprovision could not be used as the sole reason to resist suitable sites. The Inspector was clear that housing delivery over this plan period to 2027 can exceed the minimum figure stated in the Core Strategy.		development needs stretching well beyond the plan period (paragraph 85). This is necessary to ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. The Green Belt boundary review has revealed that apart from the sites that are recommended to be released from the Green Belt for development, no further site could be identified for development without damaging the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. It is therefore critical that sites are safeguarded to meet future development needs. The Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses the issue of safeguarding in detail.	
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	In March 2015, the Mayor adopted the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP). It is acknowledged that London is unable to meet its housing need in full. Given the strong functional relationship with London, it is argued that Woking could accommodate some of the housing shortfall from London. WBC have a duty to cooperate with adjoining authorities on strategic issues however evidence is lacking as to how much cooperation there has been, particularly in relation to housing issues and cooperation with the GLA. Given the scale of housing need it is incumbent that the Council has a strong strategy in place to address this. Does not consider its current approach as sound.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the GLA Plan. The matter of London not meeting its Housing supply is a wider issue and will require cooperation between many authorities to establish where the shortfall can be met. A Duty to Cooperate statement and a Consultation Statement will be published in due course as part of the submission documents to the Secretary of State to demonstrate in detail how the Council has engaged with local residents, key stakeholders, neighbouring authorities in the preparation of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	The SHMA is still being drafted and therefore we do not know the full extent of housing need in the long term. It appears illogical and premature to safeguard sites to meet future housing need without any understanding of what the need is. Conversely, there is evidence that there is a high need now, however the Council is proposing to hold back suitable land. Policy SA1 should be amended to include specific reference to the allocation of our client's site (and associated sites to the south of Woking) during this plan period	None stated.	This has been comprehensively addressed above and in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 1.0 and 2.0. To clarify the SHMA was published in October 2015.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	The following points should be considered: The housing need is higher than the minimum requirement set out in CS The inspector stressed the fact that sustainable sites should not be held back on the grounds of exceeding the minimum requirements WBC evidence recommends the release of sustainable sites from the GB. GB14 can accommodate 100 homes as well as GI. Sites to the south of Woking should be brought forward as a comprehensive development in the plan. There is no justification for the safeguarding of sites. Further discussion required with regards to the site.	None stated.	These points have been comprehensively addressed above.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	General	There is an urgent need for housing in Woking. WBC have recently joint commissioned an update to the West Surrey SHMA. The draft version published in December 2014 identified an OAN of between 390-588 dwellings to 2031. Therefore the evidence suggests that the true housing need is in excess to the 292 pa identified in the Core Strategy	None stated.	The Council has prepared an Issues and Matters Topic Paper that addresses all the above issues in detail see Section 1.0 and 2.0 The Woking Core Strategy was adopted in October 2012. Its provisions, in particular, the housing requirement was assessed against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and found sound. The housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year was supported by the Inspector against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per year. There has not been any change in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and as such its provisions continue to be up to date. The revised SHMA figure of 517 is not significantly different from the options that were previously assessed at the Core Strategy stage. There is therefore no justification at this stage to request the review of the Core Strategy housing requirement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council's main focus through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD should be towards the delivery of the Core Strategy to effect meaningful changes on the ground. The Core Strategy has its own in-built mechanism for monitoring and review, which will underpin its future review if and when it is necessary to do so. The Site Allocations DPD should not be used as proxy to review the Core Strategy, and indeed would not be appropriate for it to be used as such.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Core Strategy Inspector was supportive of the Council's case that because of the environmental constraints of the area, the historic data on housing delivery and the available evidence the delivery of 594 dwellings per year would not be environmentally sustainable, and indeed could be environmentally damaging. The same analysis is equally relevant to date.</p>	
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB14	<p>Visioning document submitted for GB14 proposing housing on the identified site.</p> <p>The supporting information sets out the geographical context, site description/analysis, the constraints and opportunities - including information regarding accessibility, vicinity to local services/facilities, flooding and drainage, topography of the site, a landscape and visual impact assessment, and an ecological assessment. The Visioning document then introduces an initial concept plan for the site.</p> <p>The representation considers that the site has potential to provide approximately 100 dwellings alongside green infrastructure. The opportunity is particularly emphasised given the housing need situation, and the context of the site in relation to other sites in the GBBR.</p> <p>Concludes that the site can come forward comprehensively alongside other sites being put forward in the Draft Site Allocation DPD and sets out an indicative framework plan of how this can be achieved.</p>	Housing be accommodated on GB14 which is being proposed for open space.	<p>The site has already been assessed in the Green Belt Boundary Review and a sustainability appraisal undertaken (reference SITE/0035/SJHH, SHLAASJHH035).</p> <p>The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground, therefore it was considered unsuitable for built development. Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure only.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB14	<p>Support the principle of development of PDL before GB, however if there is insufficient supply to address the need and PDL sites have been exhausted then there is a need to consider alternatives.</p> <p>The GBBR identified the site in option 1 and option 2. Therefore there is no justification to delay the release of the land until after the plan period.</p> <p>As set out in the NPPF, sites should be safeguarded to meet longer term needs, however there is an identified housing need now which may not be met.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation provides supporting information to allocate GB14 for residential use. This has been comprehensively addressed above.</p> <p>With regards to the approach to housing delivery this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB8	<p>Support the identification of GB8, GB10 and GB11 sites are released from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Stresses the need for proposal on these sites to be delivered comprehensively. Highlights the need for an equalisation agreement.</p>	None stated.	Support noted. The Council does not at this stage believe it is necessary to amend the wording in the key requirements relating to the equalisation agreement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB10	<p>Support the identification of GB8, GB10 and GB11 sites are released from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Stresses the need for proposal on these sites to be delivered comprehensively. Highlights the need for an equalisation agreement.</p>	None stated.	Support noted. The Council does not at this stage believe it is necessary to amend the wording in the key requirements relating to the equalisation agreement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1337	Nick	Perrins	GB11	<p>Support the identification of GB8, GB10 and GB11 sites are released from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Stresses the need for proposal on these sites to be delivered comprehensively. Highlights the need for an equalisation agreement.</p>	None stated.	Support noted. The Council does not at this stage believe it is necessary to amend the wording in the key requirements relating to the equalisation agreement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB12	<p>Concerned about the increased traffic and air pollution on already congested roads and on the health of local people. Further concerned about journeys that entail travelling over</p>	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 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
				the small bridge to Ripley towards the M3 and M25.			
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB13	Concerned about the increased traffic and air pollution on already congested roads and on the health of local people. Further concerned about journeys that entail travelling over the small bridge to Ripley towards the M3 and M25.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB12	The country's brownfield sites should be exhausted first before encroaching on the Green Belt. New community could be formed on these sites, using Pyrford as a template for fostering happy, healthy families.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 11.0 and 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB13	The country's brownfield sites should be exhausted first before encroaching on the Green Belt. New community could be formed on these sites, using Pyrford as a template for fostering happy, healthy families.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 11.0 and 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB12	Although not opposed to new housing in Pyrford that is of a sustainable number and in the right place, objects to the proposals due to their size and concerns about the capability of Pyrford to integrate over 400 new houses without significant harm to residents, Pyrford's environment and the wider community.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 9.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB13	Although not opposed to new housing in Pyrford that is of a sustainable number and in the right place, objects to the proposals due to their size and concerns about the capability of Pyrford to integrate over 400 new houses without significant harm to residents, Pyrford's environment and the wider community.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 9.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB12	Has many concerns about the proposed new development. Highlights the close knit community, fostering healthy family and community life which would be tragic to endanger by increasing the population so much and taking away Green Belt land, which is an integral part of Pyrford's healthy social environment.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0 and 23.0. It is accepted that local communities may change over time. This has always been the case and as outlined in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, if supported by adequate infrastructure and designed to a high standard, development should not negatively impact existing communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB13	Has many concerns about the proposed new development. Highlights the close knit community, fostering healthy family and community life which would be tragic to endanger by increasing the population so much and taking away Green Belt land, which is an integral part of Pyrford's healthy social environment.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0 and 23.0. It is accepted that local communities may change over time. This has always been the case and as outlined in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, if supported by adequate infrastructure and designed to a high standard, development should not negatively impact existing communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB12	There is inadequate local infrastructure to support the additional (potentially over 1,000) population, particularly regarding sewers, school and GP provision. GP provision is already overstretched.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1385	Edwina (Maggie)	Parsons	GB13	There is inadequate local infrastructure to support the additional (potentially over 1,000) population, particularly regarding sewers, school and GP provision. GP provision is already overstretched.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1391	Sarah	Patrick	GB12	Frustrated by the residents of Pyrford and supports new housing. The proposal would make 400 very happy families!	None stated.	This support is welcomed, and shows the reality of housing need in the Borough, and specifically in Pyrford. Housing need in the Borough is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1391	Sarah	Patrick	GB13	Frustrated by the residents of Pyrford and supports new housing. The proposal would make 400 very happy families!	None stated.	This support is welcomed, and shows the reality of housing need in the Borough, and specifically in Pyrford. Housing need in the Borough is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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
1391	Sarah	Patrick	GB12	A lot of families with children attending Pyrford Primary would love a house in the village. Was a former resident of Pyrford pushed out by high rental costs.	None stated.	This support is welcomed, and shows the reality of housing need in the Borough, and specifically in Pyrford. Housing need in the Borough is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1391	Sarah	Patrick	GB13	A lot of families with children attending Pyrford Primary would love a house in the village. Was a former resident of Pyrford pushed out by high rental costs.	None stated.	This support is welcomed, and shows the reality of housing need in the Borough, and specifically in Pyrford. Housing need in the Borough is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1439	Jane	Price	GB16	Further housing should not be allowed at Broadoaks, as no doubt the West Hall development will go ahead, despite objections.	Further housing should not be allowed at this site.	Comment noted, however the site is considered a sustainable location for a mixed use development, which is employment led but does include housing. Necessary infrastructure would be provided to support such a development, as detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1439	Jane	Price	GB15	The traffic lights at West Byfleet are not pedestrian friendly and will be worse with increased traffic flows.	None stated.	This representation 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 potential to improve the traffic lights at West Byfleet to make them more pedestrian friendly.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1439	Jane	Price	GB15	There are far too many dwellings proposed and nothing on expanding local infrastructure, which is currently at capacity.	If this proposal is to go ahead, the number of dwellings should be halved and consideration given to building a road at the River Wey side of the development.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1439	Jane	Price	GB16	The site should be used for offices or dwellings, not a mix of both.	None stated.	The site has an area of 14.7 hectares and has capacity to incorporate both offices and residential uses. Any proposed development will be designed to ensure to ensure a high quality environment for both.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB12	It will affect the environment hugely, including nature, local beauty and the varied wildlife.	None stated.	All sites put forward by the Council have undergone a Sustainability Appraisal to assess for negative impacts on the environment. 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
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB13	It will affect the environment hugely, including nature, local beauty and the varied wildlife.	None stated.	All sites put forward by the Council have undergone a Sustainability Appraisal to assess for negative impacts on the environment. 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	No further modification is 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 adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB12	Infrastructure around Pyrford and West Byfleet can not cope with additional population, and is overstretched already.	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
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB13	Infrastructure around Pyrford and West Byfleet can not cope with additional population, and is overstretched already. Parking will also be more difficult.	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
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB12	The volume of traffic on already congested roads, particularly at peak times, will increase.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB13	The volume of traffic on already congested roads, particularly at peak times, will increase.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB12	Objects as chose to live in Pyrford for its green landscape, not to be surrounded by houses.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1445	Tim, Louise	Porter	GB13	Objects as chose to live in Pyrford for its green landscape, not to be surrounded by houses.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	No exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy for Green Belt release, have been demonstrated for 1200 houses. The Core Strategy WBC to find sites in the Green Belt for 550 homes from 2022-27 but the Council have gone further by identifying sites from 1200 additional homes for 2027-40. While it may be sensible to look further ahead, the exceptional circumstances rule still applies, which the Council has not shown for 1200 houses in the Green Belt post 2027. The Council should be arguing the Green Belt's importance and resisting further development on it.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	No exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy for Green Belt release, have been demonstrated for 1200 houses. The Core Strategy WBC to find sites in the Green Belt for 550 homes from 2022-27 but the Council have gone further by identifying sites from 1200 additional homes for 2027-40. While it may be sensible to look further ahead, the exceptional circumstances rule still applies, which the Council has not shown for 1200 houses in the Green Belt post 2027. The Council should be arguing the Green Belt's importance and resisting further development on it.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB14	No exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy for Green Belt release, have been demonstrated for 1200 houses. The Core Strategy WBC to find sites in the Green Belt for 550 homes from 2022-27 but the Council have gone further by identifying sites from 1200 additional homes for 2027-40. While it may be sensible to look further ahead, the exceptional circumstances rule still applies, which the Council has not shown for 1200 houses in the Green Belt post 2027. The Council should be arguing the Green Belt's	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				importance and resisting further development on it.			
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	The proposals take no notice of WBC's own Core Strategy Policy CS24 - that development proposals will provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, and local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas.	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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	The proposals take no notice of WBC's own Core Strategy Policy CS24 - that development proposals will provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, and local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas.	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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB14	The proposals take no notice of WBC's own Core Strategy Policy CS24 - that development proposals will provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, and local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas.	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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	The justification of decisions is the Green Belt review, which is flawed and was not consulted on. Flaws include: The recommendation of these sites 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. Also the claim that the sites are sustainable is unfounded and optimistic as they use Good travel times, taken outside rush hour.	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. 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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	The justification of decisions is the Green Belt review, which is flawed and was not consulted on. Flaws include: The recommendation of these sites 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. Also the claim that the sites are sustainable is unfounded and optimistic as they use Good travel times, taken outside rush hour.	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. 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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB14	The justification of decisions is the Green Belt review, which is flawed and was not consulted on. Flaws include: The recommendation of these sites 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. Also the claim that the sites are sustainable is unfounded	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
				and optimistic as they use Good travel times, taken outside rush hour.		school and leisure centre at the 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 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.	
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB8	Local transport infrastructure, particularly Egley Road, is already heavily congested at peak times and will not cope with additional traffic from new housing estates, a retail park and a school will place on it.	None stated.	This representation 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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB9	Local transport infrastructure, particularly Egley Road, is already heavily congested at peak times and will not cope with additional traffic from new housing estates, a retail park and a school will place on it.	None stated.	This representation 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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	Local transport infrastructure, particularly Egley Road, is already heavily congested at peak times and will not cope with additional traffic from new housing estates, a retail park and a school will place on it.	None stated.	This representation 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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	Local transport infrastructure, particularly Egley Road, is already heavily congested at peak times and will not cope with additional traffic from new housing estates, a retail park and a school will place on it.	None stated.	This representation 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
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	The density of proposed housing (30 dph) is incompatible with the surroundings, and excessive when compared with the average of 5.5dph in Hook Heath and even less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	The density of proposed housing (30 dph) is incompatible with the surroundings, and excessive when compared with the average of 5.5dph in Hook Heath and even less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB14	The removal of the site from Green Belt to create green infrastructure is unnecessary as no change of use is planned. It is not 'an exceptional circumstance' as required for the removal of land from the Green Belt.	None stated.	This is acknowledged. While exceptional circumstances apply to other sites in Mayford and Hook Heath for their release from Green Belt for development (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12) this site is proposed for release to ensure clear and logical Green Belt boundary is drawn (as per NPPF paragraph 85), with regard to its position between sites GB8 and GB10, rather than a need for its release to accommodate development. As outlined in the allocation (and representation) the site would be protected for Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	Objects to the proposals. While understanding the need for more housing, believes the Council should and could do more to find alternatives to annexing a large swathe of Green Belt, which will have a detrimental impact on the environment for all residents.	The could should do more to find alternative sites for development.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	Objects to the proposals. While understanding the need for more housing, believes the Council should and could do more to find alternatives to annexing a large swathe of Green Belt, which will have a detrimental impact on the environment for all residents.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB14	Objects to the proposals. While understanding the need for more housing, believes the Council should and could do more to find alternatives to annexing a large swathe of Green Belt, which will have a detrimental impact on the environment for all residents.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	Concurs with Hook Heath Residents Associations objections and repeats them here. Objects as urban sprawl will be increased, and the proposals build on open space that separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt (to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages).			
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	Concurs with Hook Heath Residents Associations objections and repeats them here. Objects as urban sprawl will be increased, and the proposals build on open space that separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt (to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB14	Concurs with Hook Heath Residents Associations objections and repeats them here. Objects as urban sprawl will be increased, and the proposals build on open space that separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt (to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB10	Many people have escaped living in an urban environment to live in Surrey with its abundant green spaces, lower population density and less pollution. The proposed areas are not scrubland/or poor arable land but provide a vital amenity to all residents. The proposals have a very negative impact for us all and contradict the Council's planning policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Also please refer to Section 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB11	Many people have escaped living in an urban environment to live in Surrey with its abundant green spaces, lower population density and less pollution. The proposed areas are not scrubland/or poor arable land but provide a vital amenity to all residents. The proposals have a very negative impact for us all and contradict the Council's planning policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Also please refer to Section 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1457	C.A.	Perrin	GB14	Many people have escaped living in an urban environment to live in Surrey with its abundant green spaces, lower population density and less pollution. The proposed areas are not scrubland/or poor arable land but provide a vital amenity to all residents. The proposals have a very negative impact for us all and contradict the Council's planning policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Also please refer to Section 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB5	As a passionate environmentalist, I am devastated by these developments. Voted for the Council believing they would look out for local citizens, not ride roughshod over us.	None stated.	Objection noted. The Council has given careful consideration to the allocations put forward in the draft DPD, outlined in Sections 1.0, 2.0, 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
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB15	As a passionate environmentalist, I am devastated by these developments. Voted for the Council believing they would look out for local citizens, not ride roughshod over us.	None stated.	Objection noted. The Council has given careful consideration to the allocations put forward in the draft DPD, outlined in Sections 1.0, 2.0, 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
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB16	As a passionate environmentalist, I am devastated by these developments. Voted for the Council believing they would look out for local citizens, not ride roughshod over us.	None stated.	Objection noted. The Council has given careful consideration to the allocations put forward in the draft DPD, outlined in Sections 1.0, 2.0, 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
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB12	As a passionate environmentalist, I am devastated by these developments. Voted for the Council believing they would look out for local citizens, not ride roughshod over us.	None stated.	Objection noted. The Council has given careful consideration to the allocations put forward in the draft DPD, outlined in Sections 1.0, 2.0, 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
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB13	As a passionate environmentalist, I am devastated by these developments. Voted for the Council believing they would look out for local citizens, not ride roughshod over us.	None stated.	Objection noted. The Council has given careful consideration to the allocations put forward in the draft DPD, outlined in Sections 1.0, 2.0, 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
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB4	Byfleet will become congested beyond belief. The main junction in West Byfleet is already heaving at the best of times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB5	Byfleet will become congested beyond belief. The main junction in West Byfleet is already heaving at the best of times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB15	Byfleet will become congested beyond belief. The main junction in West Byfleet is already heaving at the best of times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB16	Byfleet will become congested beyond belief. The main junction in West Byfleet is already heaving at the best of times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB12	Byfleet will become congested beyond belief. The main junction in West Byfleet is already heaving at the best of times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB13	Byfleet will become congested beyond belief. The main junction in West Byfleet is already heaving at the best of times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB4	Vehemently objects. 98% released land is here, in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, whilst Woking has been ignored.	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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB5	Vehemently objects. 98% released land is here, in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, whilst Woking has been ignored.	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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB15	Vehemently objects. 98% released land is here, in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, whilst Woking has been ignored.	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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB16	Vehemently objects. 98% released land is here, in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, whilst Woking has been ignored.	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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% 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
						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).	
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB12	Vehemently objects. 98% released land is here, in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, whilst Woking has been ignored.	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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1485	Hugh	Pope	GB13	Vehemently objects. 98% released land is here, in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, whilst Woking has been ignored.	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). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB4	There will be an adverse effect on existing severe traffic congestion, with approximately 1,400 more homes and a 900 pupil school.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB5	There will be an adverse effect on existing severe traffic congestion, with approximately 1,400 more homes and a 900 pupil school.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB12	There will be an adverse effect on existing severe traffic congestion, with approximately 1,400 more homes and a 900 pupil school.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB13	There will be an adverse effect on existing severe traffic congestion, with approximately 1,400 more homes and a 900 pupil school.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB15	There will be an adverse effect on existing severe traffic congestion, with approximately 1,400 more homes and a 900 pupil school.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning	No further modification is 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 process.	
1494	R	Pullen	GB16	There will be an adverse effect on existing severe traffic congestion, with approximately 1,400 more homes and a 900 pupil school.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 24.0. Note that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB4	Existing infrastructure is already under strain, with regard to drainage, health etc, which will be exacerbated if these developments proceed. The opinions of local residents should be properly considered and the proposals rejected.	None stated.	The representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Council will consider all representations made in detail, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, and all other statutory and policy requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB5	Existing infrastructure is already under strain, with regard to drainage, health etc, which will be exacerbated if these developments proceed. The opinions of local residents should be properly considered and the proposals rejected.	None stated.	The representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Council will consider all representations made in detail, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, and all other statutory and policy requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB12	Existing infrastructure is already under strain, with regard to drainage, health etc, which will be exacerbated if these developments proceed. The opinions of local residents should be properly considered and the proposals rejected.	None stated.	The representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Council will consider all representations made in detail, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, and all other statutory and policy requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB13	Existing infrastructure is already under strain, with regard to drainage, health etc, which will be exacerbated if these developments proceed. The opinions of local residents should be properly considered and the proposals rejected.	None stated.	The representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Council will consider all representations made in detail, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, and all other statutory and policy requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB15	Existing infrastructure is already under strain, with regard to drainage, health etc, which will be exacerbated if these developments proceed. The opinions of local residents should be properly considered and the proposals rejected.	None stated.	The representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Council will consider all representations made in detail, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, and all other statutory and policy requirements.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB16	Existing infrastructure is already under strain, with regard to drainage, health etc, which will be exacerbated if these developments proceed. The opinions of local residents should be properly considered and the proposals rejected.	None stated.	The representation has been partly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of	No further modification is 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 the area. The Council will consider all representations made in detail, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, and all other statutory and policy requirements.	
1494	R	Pullen	GB4	Objects to the proposals. The maintenance of our Green Belt should be of prime importance, as it acts as a lung for an increasingly urbanised area.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Section 21.0 may also be relevant.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB5	Objects to the proposals. The maintenance of our Green Belt should be of prime importance, as it acts as a lung for an increasingly urbanised area.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Section 21.0 may also be relevant.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB12	Objects to the proposals. The maintenance of our Green Belt should be of prime importance, as it acts as a lung for an increasingly urbanised area.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Section 21.0 may also be relevant.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB13	Objects to the proposals. The maintenance of our Green Belt should be of prime importance, as it acts as a lung for an increasingly urbanised area.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Section 21.0 may also be relevant.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB15	Objects to the proposals. The maintenance of our Green Belt should be of prime importance, as it acts as a lung for an increasingly urbanised area.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Section 21.0 may also be relevant.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1494	R	Pullen	GB16	Objects to the proposals. The maintenance of our Green Belt should be of prime importance, as it acts as a lung for an increasingly urbanised area.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. Section 21.0 may also be relevant.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1498	Lamorna	Pritchett	GB12	The development of these fields is very unnecessary as there is plenty of other waste ground in the West Byfleet, New Haw area. Between Weybridge and New Haw stations there are several acres of waste ground that has been like that for years, is ripe for development as they are so near transportation networks. Asks why this fertile farming land is being used when such sites lie barren and wasted? Opposes the plans without following up these other areas first.	Investigate and follow up more suitable sites, particularly the acres of waste land between Weybridge and New Haw stations, before developing the Pyrford sites.	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
1498	Lamorna	Pritchett	GB13	The development of these fields is very unnecessary as there is plenty of other waste ground in the West Byfleet, New Haw area. Between Weybridge and New Haw stations there are several acres of waste ground that has been like that for years, is ripe for development as they are so near transportation networks. Asks why this fertile farming land is being used when such sites lie barren and wasted? Opposes the plans without following up these other areas first.	Investigate and follow up more suitable sites, particularly the acres of waste land between Weybridge and New Haw stations, before developing the Pyrford sites.	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
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB4	The Byfleet petition of 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB5	The Byfleet petition of 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Representor ID 1524.	
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB12	The Byfleet petition of 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB13	The Byfleet petition of 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB15	The Byfleet petition of 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB16	The Byfleet petition of 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB4	Roads around Byfleet will become gridlocked. There are already traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB5	Roads around Byfleet will become gridlocked. There are already traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB12	Roads around Byfleet will become gridlocked. There are already traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB13	Roads around Byfleet will become gridlocked. There are already traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB15	Roads around Byfleet will become gridlocked. There are already traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB16	Roads around Byfleet will become gridlocked. There are already traffic issues.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB4	Objects to the release of the sites from the Green Belt as all Green Belt land must be preserved. The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while Woking's Green Belt is preserved.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB5	Objects to the release of the sites from the Green Belt as all Green Belt land must be preserved. The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while Woking's Green Belt is preserved.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB12	Objects to the release of the sites from the Green Belt as all Green Belt land must be preserved. The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while Woking's Green Belt is preserved.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB13	Objects to the release of the sites from the Green Belt as all Green Belt land must be preserved. The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while Woking's Green Belt is preserved.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB15	Objects to the release of the sites from the Green Belt as all Green Belt land must be preserved. The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while Woking's Green Belt is preserved.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt. 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).	
1511	Robert, Susan	Pemble	GB16	Objects to the release of the sites from the Green Belt as all Green Belt land must be preserved. The proposals remove most of the local Green Belt, while Woking's Green Belt is preserved.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). In West Byfleet, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB14	What infrastructure is planned to accommodate the developments?	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that this site is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure. Nevertheless, the existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of 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's approach to infrastructure provision in general is set out 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB8	What infrastructure is planned to accommodate the developments?	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 Council's approach to infrastructure provision in general is set out 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</p>	No further modification is 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 the area.	
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB9	What infrastructure is planned to accommodate the developments?	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 Council's approach to infrastructure provision in general is set out 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB10	What infrastructure is planned to accommodate the developments?	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 Council's approach to infrastructure provision in general is set out 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB11	What infrastructure is planned to accommodate the developments?	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 Council's approach to infrastructure provision in general is set out 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</p>	No further modification is 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 could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB8	There is already congestion on the local roads and they are too narrow for additional traffic. Speeding is also an issue in Mayford and St Johns.	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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB9	There is already congestion on the local roads and they are too narrow for additional traffic. Speeding is also an issue in Mayford and St Johns.	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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB10	There is already congestion on the local roads and they are too narrow for additional traffic. Speeding is also an issue in Mayford and St Johns.	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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB11	There is already congestion on the local roads and they are too narrow for additional traffic. Speeding is also an issue in Mayford and St Johns.	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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB14	There is already congestion on the local roads and they are too narrow for additional traffic. Speeding is also an issue in Mayford and St Johns.	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB8	Should not remove Green Belt for more houses. The increase in traffic will result in gridlock. It is time to use common sense to preserve the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB9	Should not remove Green Belt for more houses. The increase in traffic will result in gridlock. It is time to use common sense to preserve the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB10	Should not remove Green Belt for more houses. The increase in traffic will result in gridlock. It is time to use common sense to preserve the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to 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.	
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB11	Should not remove Green Belt for more houses. The increase in traffic will result in gridlock. It is time to use common sense to preserve the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB14	Should not remove Green Belt for more houses. The increase in traffic will result in gridlock. It is time to use common sense to preserve the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB8	More parking spaces will be required at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB9	More parking spaces will be required at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB10	More parking spaces will be required at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB11	More parking spaces will be required at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB14	More parking spaces will be required at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB8	These developments will not cater for local people.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The recent publication of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) shows that there is great demand for private and affordable housing across the Borough. Core Strategy policy CS12 as well as the draft DPD set the affordable housing requirement for the proposed allocation. This will help to address some of the housing needs for local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB9	These developments will not cater for local people.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The recent publication of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) shows that there is great demand for private and affordable housing across the Borough. Core Strategy policy CS12 as well as the draft DPD set the affordable housing requirement for the proposed allocation. This will help to address some of the housing needs for local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB10	These developments will not cater for local people.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The recent publication of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) shows that there is great demand for private and affordable housing across the Borough. Core Strategy policy CS12 as well as the draft DPD set the affordable housing requirement for the proposed allocation. This will help to address some of the housing needs for local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB11	These developments will not cater for local people.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The recent publication of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) shows that there is great demand for private and affordable housing across the Borough. Core Strategy policy CS12 as well as the draft DPD set the affordable housing requirement for the proposed allocation. This will help to address some of the housing needs for local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1541	J.E.	Pearce	GB14	These developments will not cater for local people.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. The recent publication of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) shows that there is great demand for private and affordable housing across the Borough. Core Strategy policy CS12 as well as the draft DPD set the affordable housing requirement for the proposed allocation. This will help to address some of the housing needs for local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1546	William A	Pope	General	Want to retain the Green Belt as per the article in the Daily Mail. However do understand the need for more housing in Woking. Assumes that no Brownfield land in the area will be listed on the Government's National Register.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD proposes to allocate over 50 sites in the existing urban area, many of which are on brownfield or previously developed land. The Council will be preparing a Brownfield Register once the regulations have been published by central government.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1546	William A	Pope	GB7	Object as a Travellers site would reduce the openness of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1546	William A	Pope	GB9	Object due to extra traffic on Egley Road	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The 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
1546	William A	Pope	GB8	Object to the principle of Green Belt 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
1546	William A	Pope	GB10	Object to the principle of Green Belt 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
1546	William A	Pope	GB11	Object to the principle of Green Belt 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
1546	William A	Pope	GB14	I object. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1574	Peter	Palmer	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village will be spoilt and overcrowded.	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
1574	Peter	Palmer	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village will be spoilt and overcrowded.	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
1574	Peter	Palmer	GB12	The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments. The schools are also at capacity.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1574	Peter	Palmer	GB13	The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments. The schools are also at capacity.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1574	Peter	Palmer	GB12	The village will be overcrowded with no greenery. Hope the proposals do not go ahead.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1574	Peter	Palmer	GB13	The village will be overcrowded with no greenery. Hope the proposals do not go ahead.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1593	Karen	Povey	UA28	Gardens are important to the residents. Please consider all other options before taking them away and leaving people with no outdoor space. Children play in these gardens.	No issues with garages going and flats/shops Ash Road but Leave Gardens.	The Council notes the representation and proposed modification. The proposed allocation of this site for residential purposes is based on the consented application from 2006 (PLAN/2006/0387). As the site has outline planning permission, is located in a sustainable location close to services and facilities and within the existing urban area, the Council believe that it is suitable for development. Nevertheless the details regarding amenity space and design will need to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council has a robust policy framework to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship with adjacent buildings and that residential amenity is protected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1593	Karen	Povey	UA29	Gardens are important to the residents. Please consider all other options before taking them away and leaving people with no outdoor space. Children play in these gardens.	No issues with garages going and flats/shops Ash Road but Leave Gardens.	The Council notes the representation and proposed modification. The proposed allocation of this site for residential purposes is based on the consented application from 2006 (PLAN/2006/0387). As the site has outline planning permission, is located in a sustainable location close to services and facilities and within the existing urban area, the Council believe that it is suitable for development. Nevertheless the details regarding amenity space and design will need to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council has a robust policy framework to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship with adjacent buildings and that residential amenity is protected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1594	Margaret	Pain	General	Neutral. Pleased that Hilltop Cottage, 9 White Rose Lane or 9 The Crest, White Rose Lane are not listed for development in Section A of the DPD. Assume they will be advised of any changes.	None stated.	Noted. The Site Allocations DPD will be published for Regulation 19 consultation in due course. The Council will notify residents and the community of its publication as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure and congestion that the increased population will result in. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services - any improvements will only add to congestion.	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</p>	No further modification is 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 neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to 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 infrequent service of the public transport 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. The Council is committed to improving public transport in the Borough where possible in order to reduce car usage and promote sustainable methods of travel.</p>	
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure and congestion that the increased population will result in. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services - any improvements will only add to congestion.	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 existing infrequent service of the public transport 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. The Council is committed to improving public transport in the Borough where possible in order to reduce car usage and promote sustainable methods of travel.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure and congestion that the increased population will result in. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services - any improvements will only add to congestion.	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.</p>	No further modification is 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 infrequent service of the public transport 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. The Council is committed to improving public transport in the Borough where possible in order to reduce car usage and promote sustainable methods of travel.</p>	
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB8	The proposals will alter the local environment as well as the character of Mayford. Which will become a suburb of Woking. 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
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB9	The proposals will alter the local environment as well as the character of Mayford. Which will become a suburb of Woking. 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
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB10	The proposals will alter the local environment as well as the character of Mayford. Which will become a suburb of Woking. 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
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB11	The proposals will alter the local environment as well as the character of Mayford. Which will become a suburb of Woking. 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
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB7	Not appropriate to expand the Travellers site due to the close proximity to existing sites. Understand the demands for Traveller pitches but to concentrate them in one location is unsatisfactory.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.7 and 4.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB8	Understands the logic and need for the proposals but concerned that they will add to the situation and create an unfair burden on the area. Hope that the general concern will be given due and proper consideration.	None stated.	The Council note the concern regarding the amount of development proposed in and around Mayford. The Site Allocations DPD seeks to enable the delivery of the Core Strategy which includes 4,964 dwellings as well as office, retail and warehouse floor space. The DPD proposes over 50 sites in the existing urban area, most of which are in Woking Town Centre and are expected to come forward for development before 2027. The sites proposed in Mayford are safeguarded sites, which will meet the development needs of the Council between 2027 and 2040. It should be noted that the Council is also proposing Green Belt sites in Brookwood, Pyrford, West Byfleet and Byfleet. Although the Green Belt sites within the DPD are not evenly spread across the Borough, because of constraints such as flood plains, the site identified are in 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure such as schools, the needs of the elderly population, healthcare. This is already a concern with development taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there 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
						locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure such as schools, the needs of the elderly population, healthcare. This is already a concern with development taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1597	Patrick	Phillipps	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure such as schools, the needs of the elderly population, healthcare. This is already a concern with development taking place in the wider area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure and education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB8	Housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Ownership status of the land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. Land on escarpments and rising ground of landscape importance should not be considered suitable for development.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding development in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 to 1.12.</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 has taken into account landscape features such as Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance. The sites in landscape sensitive locations contain detailed design criteria within the specific site key requirements, to ensure that development responses to this landscape feature. Further information is also set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB9	Housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Ownership status of the land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. Land on escarpments and rising ground of landscape importance should not be considered suitable for	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding development in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 to 1.12.</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
				development.		The Council has taken into account landscape features such as Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance. The sites in landscape sensitive locations contain detailed design criteria within the specific site key requirements, to ensure that development responses to this landscape feature. Further information is also set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	
1600	Ann	Pound	GB10	Housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Ownership status of the land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. Land on escarpments and rising ground of landscape importance should not be considered suitable for development.	None stated.	The representation regarding development in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 to 1.12. The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0. The Council has taken into account landscape features such as Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance. The sites in landscape sensitive locations contain detailed design criteria within the specific site key requirements, to ensure that development responses to this landscape feature. Further information is also set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB11	Housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Ownership status of the land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. Land on escarpments and rising ground of landscape importance should not be considered suitable for development.	None stated.	The representation regarding development in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 to 1.12. The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0. The Council has taken into account landscape features such as Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance. The sites in landscape sensitive locations contain detailed design criteria within the specific site key requirements, to ensure that development responses to this landscape feature. Further information is also set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB14	Housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Ownership status of the land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. Land on escarpments and rising ground of landscape importance should not be considered suitable for development.	None stated.	The representation regarding development in the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 to 1.12. The representation regarding land ownership has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0. The Council has taken into account landscape features such as Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance. The sites in landscape sensitive locations contain detailed design criteria within the specific site key requirements, to ensure that development responses to this landscape feature. Further information is also set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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 proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
1600	Ann	Pound	GB14	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB14	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB14	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB7	Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. It will reduce the openness of the Green Belt and should be refused again. Urban areas and edge of urban areas must be considered before Green Belt that offer access to services. Mayford does not.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the sequential approach to site selection has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1600	Ann	Pound	GB7	Have extra police provisions been allowed to cater for these antisocial issues.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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.	<p>It should be noted that site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes.</p> <p>Nevertheless the representation regarding congestion and the impact on the 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 Council's response to other non transport related infrastructure has also been set out within Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.7 to 3.11.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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 congestion and the impact on the 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 Council's response to other non transport related infrastructure has also been set out within Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.7 to 3.11.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1600	Ann	Pound	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 congestion and the impact on the 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 Council's response to other non transport related infrastructure has also been set out within Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.7 to 3.11.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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 congestion and the impact on the 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 Council's response to other non transport related infrastructure has also been set out within Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.7 to 3.11.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact on the 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 Council's response to other non transport related infrastructure has also been set out within Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.7 to 3.11.</p> <p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is 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.		<p>The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>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>	
1600	Ann	Pound	GB8	The schools and doctors are already at capacity and there are no local amenities, which will result in high car usage.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB9	The schools and doctors are already at capacity and there are no local amenities, which will result in high car usage.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1600	Ann	Pound	GB10	The schools and doctors are already at capacity and there are no local amenities, which will result in high car usage.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB11	The schools and doctors are already at capacity and there are no local amenities, which will result in high car usage.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB14	The schools and doctors are already at capacity and there are no local amenities, which will result in high car usage.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to</p>	No further modification is 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>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>	
1600	Ann	Pound	GB7	The users of the site create rubbish that is highly visible.	None stated.	<p>The site is currently 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. The Council also has policies in place for the provision of waste storage within residential developments, as set out in CS21: Design as well as Waste and recycling provisions for new residential developments guidance. In combination with effective management of the site, the proposed allocation is not expected to have an adverse impact on waste generation and general amenity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	GB7	The site is adjacent to an SSSI and would further decrease the visual amenity and increase the risk to wildlife and local residents through dangerous rubbish and fly-tipping. Travellers keep dangerous animals and could cause a risk to pets, children and wildlife.	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 and storage and collection of waste. 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>Taking the above into account, the Council does not believe that development of the site will create a risk to local pets, children or wildlife.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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
1600	Ann	Pound	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proximity of the development.		<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>	of this representation
1600	Ann	Pound	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1600	Ann	Pound	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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. It is your duty to protect the environment for future generations.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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. It is your duty to protect the environment for future generations.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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. It is your duty to protect the environment for future generations.	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
1600	Ann	Pound	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	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
				also to represent my views. It is your duty to protect the environment for future generations.		<p>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>	
1600	Ann	Pound	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. It is your duty to protect the environment for future generations.	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
1648	J, B	Patel	GB7	An increase in pitches would put a strain on local infrastructure and wildlife. This is due to the close proximity of domestic animals.	None stated.	<p>The proposal to increase the number of pitches on the existing Traveller site is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on the local infrastructure. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1648	J, B	Patel	GB7	Object as there are currently enough Traveller pitches in and around Mayford.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1648	J, B	Patel	GB8	Strongly object. The existing road network would not be able to cope with additional development. They are narrow and unlit. It will increase congestion. The proposed school and leisure centre will make matters worse.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1648	J, B	Patel	GB9	Strongly object. The existing road network would not be able to cope with additional development. They are narrow and unlit. It will increase congestion. The proposed school and leisure centre will make matters worse.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1648	J, B	Patel	GB10	Strongly object. The existing road network would not be able to cope with additional development. They are narrow and unlit. It will increase congestion. The proposed school and leisure centre will make matters worse.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1648	J, B	Patel	GB11	Strongly object. The existing road network would not be able to cope with additional development. They are narrow and unlit. It will increase congestion. The proposed school and leisure centre will make matters worse.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1648	J, B	Patel	GB14	Strongly object. The existing road network would not be able to cope with additional development. They are narrow and unlit. It will increase congestion. The proposed school and leisure centre will make matters worse.	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</p>	No further modification is 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>It should be noted that site GB14 is not proposed for development but for Green Infrastructure purposes.</p>	
1648	J, B	Patel	GB8	Development will result in Woking, Mayford and Guildford merging into one. Mayford is a historical site and the GBBR is incorrect on this matter. The review is inconsistent. Therefore the site should be rejected. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and has historical links that should be preserved. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
1648	J, B	Patel	GB9	Development will result in Woking, Mayford and Guildford merging into one. Mayford is a historical site and the GBBR is incorrect on this matter. The review is inconsistent. Therefore the site should be rejected. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and has historical links that should be preserved. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
1648	J, B	Patel	GB10	Development will result in Woking, Mayford and Guildford merging into one. Mayford is a historical site and the GBBR is incorrect on this matter. The review is inconsistent. Therefore the site should be rejected. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and has historical links that should be preserved. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
1648	J, B	Patel	GB11	Development will result in Woking, Mayford and Guildford merging into one. Mayford is a historical site and the GBBR is incorrect on this matter. The review is inconsistent. Therefore the site should be rejected. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and has historical links that should be preserved. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
1648	J, B	Patel	GB14	Development will result in Woking, Mayford and Guildford merging into one. Mayford is a historical site and the GBBR is incorrect on this matter. The review is inconsistent. Therefore the site should be rejected. Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and has historical links that should	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				be preserved. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.		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.	
1650	M.W.	Poffley	GB8	There will be a negative impact on local wildlife that has not been quantified.	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
1650	M.W.	Poffley	GB8	Object to the proposal for school and leisure centre. Green Belts were established for specific reasons and development within them requires special circumstances. Although the GBBR noted that this site is suitable for a school, not convinced that the exception circumstances exist or that alternatives have been considered. Should have also considered Shey Copse, Havering Farm and West Byfleet. Although these sites may have required compromises or been more expensive, they do not in themselves warrant exceptional circumstances. Given the purchase price of the site, I would seek reassurance that public money was being assigned in a responsible manner. Would like to see the business case to support all the alternatives, including the risk assessment for each proposition. Unconvinced that alternative brown field sites could not offer a better alternative to Green Belt sites. The reprovision of facilities at Sheerwater bring into question why smaller urban area sites cannot be used for housing requirements, noting the demand for high density development in the town centre.	Consider Havering Farm, West Byfleet and Shey Copse	<p>Objection to the proposed school and leisure centre is noted.</p> <p>The case for very special circumstances to development in the Green Belt and a review of alternative sites within the Borough for an educational facility has been set out in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee when the application was approved. See Section VSC4. This is available for viewing on the Council's website.</p> <p>The representation regarding land ownership and the business case for alternative sites is not a planning consideration.</p> <p>The Council's has considered a number of sites within the existing urban area to meet existing and future housing needs. This is clearly set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 9.0 and Section 11.0. The Council note the proposed modifications. The Council has considered both Havering Farm and Shey Copse for residential development, neither of them were considered to be suitable. The Council has also considered a number of sites in West Byfleet and are proposing to allocate West Hall and Broadoaks (GB15 and GB16) for development (offices and housing). None of the three sites were considered to be suitable for an educational facility of this nature.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1650	M.W.	Poffley	GB8	There will be a number of significant negative impacts including traffic, physical, light and noise pollution and views locally.	None stated.	<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.</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 without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The key requirements for the site note that due to the proximity to the railway line and road the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and air pollution and ensure mitigation measures are implemented. A Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment could be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure noise and air pollution are considered by new development and mitigation measures are identified and implemented.</p> <p>The representation regarding impact on views and landscape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p>	
1650	M.W.	Poffley	GB8	Strongly object to remove land from the Green Belt. Not all brownfield sites have been considered. This questions the exceptional circumstance status that underpins the application.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed 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
1650	M.W.	Poffley	GB8	The GBBR was not subject to consultation or any briefing of the findings. The process is called into question and raised doubt over the current application as the due process or diligence has not been observed. Seeking reassurance that this is not the case.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review was published by the Council in January 2014. As per all evidence based documents and in accordance with national planning legislation, the Green Belt boundary review was published without public consultation. The Green Belt boundary review is a technical document that contains a number of recommendations to the Council. It is just one document of many that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. Nevertheless the Green Belt boundary review was noted on the Council's website as well as in the local media at the time of publication. In total, the Green Belt boundary review has been published and available on the Council's website for review 17 months prior to the start of the draft Site Allocations DPD Regulation 18 consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
1668	J P	People	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1668	J P	People	GB8	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	GB9	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	GB10	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	GB11	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				allowed within 400m.			
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or	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
				proximity of the development.		<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>	of this representation
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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			
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	GB8	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	GB9	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	GB10	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</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
1668	J P	People	GB11	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1668	J P	People	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						transport terms.	
1668	J P	People	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</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
1668	J P	People	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<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
1668	J P	People	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	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.		<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. 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>	
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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.	<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 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
1668	J P	People	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.	<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 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
1668	J P	People	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	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 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
				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.			
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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
1668	J P	People	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	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	of this representation
1681	J, P	Prentice	General	Object to the proposal in order to conserve the Green Belt. It would not be to the benefit of Pyle Hill and would be the beginning of the end of the community.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1691	J M	People	GB11	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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</p>	No further modification is 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>	
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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</p>	No further modification is 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).	
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	GB8	The additional visits per week will have negative impact on an already overloaded road network whilst the public transport in the area is dire.	None stated.	The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new	No further modification is 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>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>	
1691	J M	People	GB8	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1691	J M	People	GB9	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1691	J M	People	GB10	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</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
1691	J M	People	GB11	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</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
1691	J M	People	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1691	J M	People	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<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
1691	J M	People	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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 Worpleston 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
1691	J M	People	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 Worpleston 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
1691	J M	People	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 Worpleston 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
1691	J M	People	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 Worpleston 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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1691	J M	People	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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB8	A school and recreational facilities will create further traffic congestion throughout the weekend and evenings.	None stated.	The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1695	Barbara	Page	GB8	<p>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.</p> <p>Strongly object.</p>	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
1695	Barbara	Page	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Strongly object.			
1695	Barbara	Page	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. Strongly object.	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
1695	Barbara	Page	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. Strongly object.	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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB14	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties. Strongly object.	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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB7	The road is residential and includes heritage assets. The proposal, associated amenities and business activities will be unsuitable and out of keeping with the character of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1695	Barbara	Page	GB8	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the village. 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 12.0 and Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1695	Barbara	Page	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the village. 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 12.0 and Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1695	Barbara	Page	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the village. 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 12.0 and Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1695	Barbara	Page	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the village. 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 12.0 and Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1695	Barbara	Page	GB14	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals will have a devastating impact on the village. 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 12.0 and Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1695	Barbara	Page	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.	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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB8	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and there is not provision to support additional residents. Without access to a vehicle or an improved public transport network, future residents will be isolated.	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 Council has also responded to the representation regarding existing and proposed infrastructure in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB9	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and there is not provision to support additional residents. Without access to a vehicle or an improved public transport network, future residents will be isolated.	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 Council has also responded to the representation regarding existing and proposed infrastructure in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The existing issues regarding public transport 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,</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1695	Barbara	Page	GB10	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and there is not provision to support additional residents. Without access to a vehicle or an improved public transport network, future residents will be isolated.	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 Council has also responded to the representation regarding existing and proposed infrastructure in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB11	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and there is not provision to support additional residents. Without access to a vehicle or an improved public transport network, future residents will be isolated.	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 Council has also responded to the representation regarding existing and proposed infrastructure in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB14	The existing infrastructure is at capacity and there is not provision to support additional residents. Without access to a vehicle or an improved public transport network, future residents will be isolated.	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 Council has also responded to the representation regarding existing and proposed infrastructure in the 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
						The existing issues regarding public transport 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.	
1695	Barbara	Page	GB8	The public transport in the area is limited and most residents travel by car. This will increase with the proposals and create further traffic and congestion.	None stated.	The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB9	The public transport in the area is limited and most residents travel by car. This will increase with the proposals and create further traffic and congestion.	None stated.	The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB10	The public transport in the area is limited and most residents travel by car. This will increase with the proposals and create further traffic and congestion.	None stated.	The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB11	The public transport in the area is limited and most residents travel by car. This will increase with the proposals and create further traffic and congestion.	None stated.	The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB14	The public transport in the area is limited and most residents travel by car. This will increase with the proposals and create further traffic and congestion.	None stated.	The existing issues regarding public transport 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB8	The local roads are narrow and not all have a pavement or lighting	None stated.	<p>The draft allocation sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. The Council is also working with the County Council to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and street lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB9	The local roads are narrow and not all have a pavement or lighting	None stated.	The draft allocation sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. The Council is also working with the County Council to prepare 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>Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and street lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
1695	Barbara	Page	GB10	The local roads are narrow and not all have a pavement or lighting	None stated.	<p>The draft allocation sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. The Council is also working with the County Council to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and street lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB11	The local roads are narrow and not all have a pavement or lighting	None stated.	<p>The draft allocation sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. The Council is also working with the County Council to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and street lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB14	The local roads are narrow and not all have a pavement or lighting	None stated.	<p>The draft allocation sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage. The Council is also working with the County Council to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and street lighting to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1695	Barbara	Page	GB7	The area does not have reasonable access to schools or other facilities and therefore the site is not suitable. Strongly object.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community</p>	No further modification is 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 help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB8	Egley Road is not suitable for a school. Public transport is limited and additional cars will create gridlock.	None stated.	The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB7	Object. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB8	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford. The Green Belt ad definition and quality of life, fresh air and amenity value. The proposals will have a negative impact on Mayford village and its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB9	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford. The Green Belt ad definition and quality of life, fresh air and amenity value. The proposals will have a negative impact on Mayford village and its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB10	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford. The Green Belt ad definition and quality of life, fresh air and amenity value. The proposals will have a negative impact on Mayford village and its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB11	Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford. The Green Belt ad definition and quality of life, fresh air and amenity value. The proposals will have a negative impact on Mayford village and its character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 21.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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. Development will also increase surface water and flood risk.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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. Development will also increase surface water and flood risk.	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 flooding 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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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. Development will also increase surface water and flood risk.	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> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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. Development will also increase surface water and flood risk.	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 flooding 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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic and pollution which will have a negative impact on health.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle access is required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic and pollution which will have a negative impact on health.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle access is required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic and pollution which will have a negative impact on health.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle access is required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic and pollution which will have a negative impact on health.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle access is required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB8	Houses and schools can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. There are no robust solutions to the traffic problems.	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB9	Houses and schools can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. There are no robust solutions to the traffic problems.	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
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB10	Houses and schools can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be	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.	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
				dangerous as there are no pavements. There are no robust solutions to the traffic problems.		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.	of this representation
1697	Dawn	Pearson	GB11	Houses and schools can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. There are no robust solutions to the traffic problems.	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
1700	Mike	Pearce	UA28	This area is now an established habitat for a wide range of flora fauna and animal and insect life	None stated.	The Council will consider the biodiversity value of the site at the detailed planning application stage. Nevertheless the Council has robust policies in place to ensure that habitats and biodiversity are protected and suitable mitigation measures are implemented if any harm is created as a result of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1700	Mike	Pearce	UA28	Residents will lose garden land	None stated.	The proposed allocation of this site for residential purposes is based on the consented application from 2006 (PLAN/2006/0387). As the site has outline planning permission, is located in a sustainable location close to services and facilities and within the existing urban area, the Council believe that it is suitable for development. Nevertheless the details regarding amenity space and design will need to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council has a robust policy framework to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship with adjacent buildings and that residential amenity is protected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1700	Mike	Pearce	UA28	Traffic and congestion are already issues locally and further development will make the situation worse on top of other developments in the local area.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. Included in the Key Requirements is reference to effective access arrangements to ensure highway safety and the potential for major highway improvements. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB10	The proposals would not be consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS24.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB11	The proposals would not be consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS24.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB14	The proposals would not be consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS24.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB10	The transport infrastructure in the area is already congested and unable to handle additional traffic. There is a limited public transport service. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot. How can it be justified to develop housing estates, a retail park and new school without supporting infrastructure. This is a common theme across the Borough.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 3.0. 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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The 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 limited public transport service in the area 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> <p>To clarify, the Council is not proposing to allocate a retail park in Mayford. 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>	
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB11	The transport infrastructure in the area is already congested and unable to handle additional traffic. There is a limited public transport service. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot. How can it be justified to develop housing estates, a retail park and new school without supporting infrastructure. This is a common theme across the Borough.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 3.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>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 limited public transport service in the area 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						To clarify, the Council is not proposing to allocate a retail park in Mayford. 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.	
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB14	The transport infrastructure in the area is already congested and unable to handle additional traffic. There is a limited public transport service. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible by foot. How can it be justified to develop housing estates, a retail park and new school without supporting infrastructure. This is a common theme across the Borough.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 3.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>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 limited public transport service in the area 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> <p>To clarify, the Council is not proposing to allocate a retail park in Mayford. 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
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB10	Green Belt policy is to control urban growth, create a long term ring of countryside and maintain rural and leisure activities. The most important attribute of Green Belt is its openness.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>In addition the Council has considered the landscape impacts of the proposed allocations and has set this out in section 7.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB11	Green Belt policy is to control urban growth, create a long term ring of countryside and maintain rural and leisure activities. The most important attribute of Green Belt is its	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>In addition the Council has considered the landscape impacts of the proposed allocations and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				openness.		has set this out in section 7.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB14	Green Belt policy is to control urban growth, create a long term ring of countryside and maintain rural and leisure activities. The most important attribute of Green Belt is its openness.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0, 2.0 and 15.0. In addition the Council has considered the landscape impacts of the proposed allocations and has set this out in section 7.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB10	The case for exceptional circumstances has not been made for the safeguarded sites. WBC should protect Green Belt and resist development within it.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB11	The case for exceptional circumstances has not been made for the safeguarded sites. WBC should protect Green Belt and resist development within it.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB14	The case for exceptional circumstances has not been made for the safeguarded sites. WBC should protect Green Belt and resist development within it.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB10	No public consultation on the Green Belt boundary review.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB11	No public consultation on the Green Belt boundary review.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB14	No public consultation on the Green Belt boundary review.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB10	Agree with the objections from the Mayford Village Society. Reconsider the proposals.	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
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB11	Agree with the objections from the Mayford Village Society. Reconsider the proposals.	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
1701	Robert and Angela	Porter	GB14	Agree with the objections from the Mayford Village Society. Reconsider the proposals.	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