

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB10	Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and prevents settlements from merging with each other. This assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	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. As part of the site identification process in the Green Belt boundary review, the various parcels of land were assessed against the purposes of Green Belt, including preventing urban sprawl and the merging of towns.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p> <p>The Council 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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB11	Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and prevents settlements from merging with each other. This assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	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. As part of the site identification process in the Green Belt boundary review, the various parcels of land were assessed against the purposes of Green Belt, including preventing urban sprawl and the merging of towns.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p> <p>The Council 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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB14	Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and prevents settlements from merging with each other. This assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	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. As part of the site identification process in the Green Belt boundary review, the various parcels of land were assessed against the purposes of Green Belt, including preventing urban sprawl and the merging of towns.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p> <p>The Council 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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB10	Hook Heath is an Urban Area of Special Residential Character and there are various Conservation Areas in the local area	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes.</p> <p>It is correct that parts of Hook Heath have conservation area status and that the special character of Hook Heath is recognised in various Planning documents including The Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The impact of the proposed allocations on these heritage assets has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these</p>	No further modification is 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 will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB11	Hook Heath is an Urban Area of Special Residential Character and there are various Conservation Areas in the local area	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes.</p> <p>It is correct that parts of Hook Heath have conservation area status and that the special character of Hook Heath is recognised in various Planning documents including The Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The impact of the proposed allocations on these heritage assets has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB14	Hook Heath is an Urban Area of Special Residential Character and there are various Conservation Areas in the local area	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure purposes.</p> <p>It is correct that parts of Hook Heath have conservation area status and that the special character of Hook Heath is recognised in various Planning documents including The Heritage of Woking and the Woking Character Study. The impact of the proposed allocations on these heritage assets has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB10	Not clear how the proposals are consistent with the objectives of the Green Belt and the character of the local area. The plans will have a detrimental impact on local residents. The proposals are not consistent with Hook Heath being a desirable and prestigious place to live. No exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt have been set out.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding the character of the local area has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB11	Not clear how the proposals are consistent with the objectives of the Green Belt and the character of the local area. The plans will have a detrimental impact on local residents. The proposals are not consistent with Hook Heath being a desirable and prestigious place to live. No exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt have been set out.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding the character of the local area has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB14	Not clear how the proposals are consistent with the objectives of the Green Belt and the character of the local area. The plans will have a detrimental impact on local residents. The proposals are not consistent with Hook Heath being a desirable and prestigious place to live. No exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt have been set out.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding the character of the local area has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB10	Concerned about the impact on transport infrastructure which have not been set out. The proposals will result in additional traffic and the roads were not designed to cope with such volumes of traffic. There are already issues with speeding.	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB11	Concerned about the impact on transport infrastructure which have not been set out. The proposals will result in additional traffic and the roads were not designed to cope with such volumes of traffic. There are already issues with speeding.	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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB14	Concerned about the impact on transport infrastructure which have not been set out. The proposals will result in additional traffic and the roads were not designed to cope with such volumes of traffic. There are already issues with speeding.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB10	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances	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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances	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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB14	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances	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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB10	The proposed housing densities are significantly higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this.	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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB11	The proposed housing densities are significantly higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this.	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
767	Warwick	Sabey	GB14	The proposed housing densities are significantly higher than the average density of Hook Heath and there is no justification for this.	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha.</p> <p>The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						contributions will be sought to make provision for green infrastructure.	
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fiel and lancape 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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	GB8	Objects to removal of land from Green Belt	Don't remove land from the Green Belt	<p>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	<p>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	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
277	Giancarlo	Saccomani	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB12	Pyrford charm and character are important and it is also important to maintain the natural lancape and views and any footpaths. Pyrford is unique in Woking with unspoilt countryside and an asset. Development would have a negative impact on this asset. It has historic assets which are highly valued nationally. Green Belt development could have a negative impact on the heritage assets.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding character and lancape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p> <p>The 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>The representation regarding heritage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p>	
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB13	<p>Pyrford charm and character are important and it is also important to maintain the natural lancape and views and any footpaths. Pyrford is unique in Woking with unspoilt countryside and an asset. Development would have a negative impact on this asset. It has historic assets which are highly valued nationally. Green Belt development could have a negative impact on the heritage assets.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding character and lancape has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p> <p>The 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>The representation regarding heritage has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB12	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford. It would blight land in the Green Belt and have a negative impact on heritage views. The site was not recommended in the GBBR.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding views and lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p> <p>The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford. It would blight land in the Green Belt and have a negative impact on heritage views. The site was not recommended in the GBBR.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding views and lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In lancape terms, the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p> <p>The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB12	<p>The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There are no supporting facilities including education provision. People live in Pyrford for the pleasant environment. Safety is important and the character can not be easily re-created. Development will change this character and is the wrong local housing solution.</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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.</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 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. 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>	
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There are no supporting facilities including education provision. People live in Pyrford for the pleasant environment. Safety is important and the character can not be easily re-created. Development will change this character and is the wrong local housing solution.	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 representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.</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
						<p>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 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>	
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB12	The nature of the village and surrounding green lancape is important to local people. The draft Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan demonstrates that local people are concerned about local infrastructure alongside other developments in the wider area. This could lead to gridlock. The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account nor has the Council followed the recommendations in the GBBR.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway, taking into account development proposals within and around the Borough. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.</p> <p>The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
834	Akeel	Sachak	GB13	The nature of the village and surrounding green lancape is important to local people. The draft Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan demonstrates that local people are concerned about local infrastructure alongside other developments in the wider area. This could lead to gridlock. The views of Pyrford	None stated.	<p>The Council note the lancape character of the area and its importance to local people. The has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council has and will continue to work with the relevant infrastructure providers to make sure that infrastructure provision is in line with development. The has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account nor has the Council followed the recommendations in the GBBR.		<p>As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.</p> <p>The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p>	
1116	Adam Pam	Sadler	GB12	We truly value Pyrford's green open spaces, trees, river/canal, water meadows and village feel. The proposed development, together with other developments in West Byfleet and Wisley Airfield, will wreck the rural village feel. Infrastructure will be unable to support the additional traffic, demand for school places and health services. Coldharbour Road is already congested and dangerous at school drop off/pick up times. Old Woking Road is too busy, noisy and fast. Ideally we need another crossing island to allow children to cross Old Woking Rd more safely. The development will have a massive negative impact on Pyrford Common Road and Newark Lane. Please consider the impact on roads, families and children. We moved out of London for this lifestyle change and would be sad to see this overdevelopment.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1116	Adam Pam	Sadler	GB13	We truly value Pyrford's green open spaces, trees, river/canal, water meadows and village feel. The proposed development, together with other developments in West Byfleet and Wisley Airfield, will wreck the rural village feel. Infrastructure will be unable to support the additional traffic, demand for school places and health services. Coldharbour Road is already congested and dangerous at school drop off/pick up times. Old Woking Road is too busy, noisy and fast. Ideally we need another crossing island to allow children to cross Old Woking Rd more safely. The development will have a massive negative impact on Pyrford Common Road and Newark Lane. Please consider the impact on roads, families and children. We moved out of London for this lifestyle change and would be sad to see this overdevelopment.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
854	K	Sandford	GB16	Do not support the Octagon proposal of residential and school. A school would add little to the community and is not the best use if land.	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
						<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 has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on illegal parking, the Local Planning Authority would recommend that this is brought to the attention of Woking Borough Council's Parking Services and the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	
854	K	Sandford	GB15	Identified other areas for residential across the borough to accommodate the balance of the housing proposed under GB15 and GB16, to make it fairer.	Identify other areas for residential across the borough.	<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
854	K	Sandford	GB16	Identified other areas for residential across the borough to accommodate the balance of the housing proposed under GB15 and GB16, to make it fairer.	Identify other areas for residential across the borough.	<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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
854	K	Sandford	GB16	The site should be residential and provide a Community Centre. There is a need for a centre in West Byfleet. This would create a new, well integrated community with West Byfleet which lower infrastructure demands.	The whole site should be used for housing and a Community Centre, similar infrastructure developments would be required, but at a reduced level.	<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
854	K	Sandford	GB16	Only GB16 (and not GB15) should be developed because its a more acceptable expansion of West Byfleet; reduces the extent of infrastructure development needed, reduces the increased demand on local services and facilities; reduces the increased traffic and air pollution on the A245; and retains the purpose of the Green Belt of West Hall.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
854	K	Sandford	GB15	<p>The proposed number of dwellings will dramatically change the scale of West Byfleet and ruin the open character of this site.</p> <p>Significant additional infrastructure will be required including A245 improvements, school places, healthcare and parking. The A245 is already congested. Will contribute toward more air pollution. Site is prone to flooding after heavy rainfall, loss of surface drainage will make this worse and potentially affect other areas.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. It should be noted that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more land in the Green Belt to meet development needs.</p> <p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure 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 monitors air quality throughout the Borough to make sure pollution levels remain below the recommended/legal limit. In terms of Planning Policy, Core Strategy Policy CS21 as well as the Development Management Policies DPD set out a robust policy framework to make sure that new development does not have a significant impact on air quality. Where a negative impact is identified, the Council will require mitigation measures to be implemented. This can only be determined at the planning application stage, when development proposals are considered in more detail and where up to date evidence can be used to establish air quality</p>	No further modification is 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>levels.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
854	K	Sandford	GB16	Support this proposal. Older local residents will benefit being able to down size and remain close to centre facilities.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on illegal parking, the Local Planning Authority would recommend that this is brought to the attention of Woking Borough Council's Parking Services and the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
159	S	Sanmartin	GB12	The village and its open field are popular with ramblers, walkers, runners, cyclists and young families with children, a country setting set in relatively close proximity to London.	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the enjoyment of these activities by residents and other users will be significantly undermined by the proposals.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
159	S	Sanmartin	GB13	The village and its open field are popular with ramblers, walkers, runners, cyclists and young families with children, a country setting set in relatively close proximity to London.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the enjoyment of these activities by residents and other users will be significantly undermined by the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
159	S	Sanmartin	GB12	Object as development would ruin a beautiful Surrey village, resulting in an over-populated housing estate. There are potentially serious traffic danger hotspots, pinch points and junctions. Surrounding roads are narrow. All approach routes are at capacity.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of the area. This particular matter is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 23 and 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
159	S	Sanmartin	GB13	Object as development would ruin a beautiful Surrey village, resulting in an over-populated housing estate. There are potentially serious traffic danger hotspots, pinch points and junctions. Surrounding roads are narrow. All approach routes are at capacity.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall character of the area. This particular matter is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 23 and 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
159	S	Sanmartin	GB13	Pyrford was immediately appealing to us due to its rural setting and village atmosphere, both of which would be lost if the development were to take place.	None stated.	The Council acknowledge the distinctive character of Pyrford and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
159	S	Sanmartin	GB12	Pyrford was immediately appealing to us due to its rural setting and village atmosphere, both of which would be lost if the development were to take place.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the proposals will significantly undermine the overall character of the area. The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23 and 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
159	S	Sanmartin	GB12	Pyrford is popular with cyclists (London and Surrey 100 bike race) for both commuting and leisure, particularly Upshot Lane and Pyrford Common Road. A considerable increase in traffic on these roads would result in accidents or cyclists avoiding the area. We both understand the requirements to supply additional housing but we strongly object to the proposed location in Pyrford.	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
159	S	Sanmartin	GB13	Pyrford is popular with cyclists (London and Surrey 100 bike race) for both commuting and leisure, particularly Upshot Lane and Pyrford Common Road. A considerable increase in	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				traffic on these roads would result in accidents or cyclists avoiding the area. We both understand the requirements to supply additional housing but we strongly object to the proposed location in Pyrford.		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 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.	
108	M	Santos	GB12	Object to development in Pyrford. Pyrford started as a small village and has now expanded to almost merge with West Byfleet and the surrounding villages	None stated.	The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals is addressed in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the overall character of the area. This issue is also articulated in detail in Section 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
108	M	Santos	GB12	Pyrford has lost its identity/character as a small quiet area	None stated.	The Council acknowledge the distinctive character of Pyrford and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
108	M	Santos	GB12	As prime GB, the land should be kept for ecological and environmental reasons. Proposals could mean the possible destruction of habitats for local wildlife and birds	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites	No further modification is 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.	
108	M	Santos	GB12	Local infrastructure cannot support added populous of 400 additional houses. This will lead to further congestion, noise, pollution on already overcrowded narrow roads. There is currently a limited bus service every hour	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution including noise as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD. The general approach to traffic and infrastructure provision are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
108	M	Santos	GB12	It doesn't make sense to encroach upon the land, and destroy the character. Continue search for another site which is derelict and suitable for construction	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the identified needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the need over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet need from 2022. This particular issues 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
108	M	Santos	GB12	Further development will lead to overcrowding that will be detrimental to the peaceful character of the area	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
108	M	Santos	GB13	Object to development in Pyrford. Pyrford started as a small village and has now expanded to almost merge with West Byfleet and the surrounding villages	None stated.	The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals is addressed in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the overall character of the area. This issue is also articulated in detail in Section 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
108	M	Santos	GB13	Pyrford has lost its identity/character as a small quiet area	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						implications 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.	
108	M	Santos	GB13	As prime GB, the land should be kept for ecological and environmental reasons. Proposals could mean the possible destruction of habitats for local wildlife and birds	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the ecological value of the sites. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
108	M	Santos	GB13	Local infrastructure cannot support added populous of 400 additional houses. This will lead to further congestion, noise, pollution on already overcrowded narrow roads. There is currently a limited bus service every hour	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution including noise as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD. The general approach to traffic and infrastructure provision are comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
108	M	Santos	GB13	It doesn't make sense to encroach upon the land, and destroy the character. Continue search for another site which is derelict and suitable for construction	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected. The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the identified needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the need over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet need from 2022. This particular issues 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
108	M	Santos	GB13	Further development will lead to overcrowding that will be detrimental to the peaceful character of the area	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	No consideration has been given to the importance of access to green space	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.2 and 3.7 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	No consideration has been given to the importance of access to green space	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.2 and 3.7 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	No consideration has been given to the importance of access to green space	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.2 and 3.7 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	No consideration has been given to the importance of access to green space	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.2 and 3.7 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	No consideration has been given to the importance of access to green space	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 particularly paragraph 3.2 and 3.7 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB7	Mayford already makes a significant contribution to the traveller community with several traveller sites in the vicinity. There is no justification for expansion here.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	Proposals will diminish the appearance of Woking and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	Proposals will diminish the appearance of Woking and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	Proposals will diminish the appearance of Woking and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	Proposals will diminish the appearance of Woking and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	Proposals will diminish the appearance of Woking and the quality of life enjoyed by its residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB7	Intensified use of the site would result in heavy traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	Proposals for the management of traffic in the area grossly underestimates the problem in the area. A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	Permission has been granted for the school proposal at Egley Road. The proposal was comprehensively assessed on the potential impact on traffic. Additional traffic was acknowledged but it was concluded that the increase would not be material. The Officer's report can be found online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	Proposals for the management of traffic in the area grossly underestimates the problem in the area. A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without	Permission has been granted for the school proposal at Egley Road. The proposal was comprehensively assessed on the potential impact on traffic. Additional traffic was acknowledged but it was concluded that the increase would not be material. The Officer's report can be found online	No further modification is 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 development.		
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	Proposals for the management of traffic in the area grossly underestimates the problem in the area. A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	Permission has been granted for the school proposal at Egley Road. The proposal was comprehensively assessed on the potential impact on traffic. Additional traffic was acknowledged but it was concluded that the increase would not be material. The Officer's report can be found online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	Proposals for the management of traffic in the area grossly underestimates the problem in the area. A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	Permission has been granted for the school proposal at Egley Road. The proposal was comprehensively assessed on the potential impact on traffic. Additional traffic was acknowledged but it was concluded that the increase would not be material. The Officer's report can be found online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	Proposals for the management of traffic in the area grossly underestimates the problem in the area. A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	A clear and well planned proposal for the transport system must be worked out even without any development.	Permission has been granted for the school proposal at Egley Road. The proposal was comprehensively assessed on the potential impact on traffic. Additional traffic was acknowledged but it was concluded that the increase would not be material. The Officer's report can be found online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	The purpose of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent the coalescence of towns. The development of these areas will lead to the merging of Mayford, Woking and Guildford	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The design of the proposal was considered in the Officer's report paragraph 109-117 and 122-127 and it was considered acceptable subject to conditions requiring approval of materials and relating to levels on the site . The Officer's report is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The design of the proposal was considered in the Officer's report paragraph 109-117 and 122-127 and it was considered acceptable subject to conditions requiring approval of materials and relating to levels on the site . The Officer's report is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The design of the proposal was considered in the Officer's report paragraph 109-117 and 122-127 and it was considered acceptable subject to conditions requiring approval of materials and relating to levels on the site . The Officer's report is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The design of the proposal was considered in the Officer's report paragraph 109-117 and 122-127 and it was considered acceptable subject to conditions requiring approval of materials and relating to levels on the site . The Officer's report is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	Advise that the design of the school should be sympathetically designed within its context in the GB	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The design of the proposal was considered in the Officer's report paragraph 109-117 and 122-127 and it was considered acceptable subject to conditions requiring approval of materials and relating to levels on the site . The Officer's report is available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	No consideration has been given to the need to preserve the character of Mayford. It is important for villages to maintain their own identity. Development of these sites will remove the 'green approach' from south of the Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0 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
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	No consideration has been given to the need to preserve the character of Mayford. It is important for villages to maintain their own identity. Development of these sites will remove the 'green approach' from south of the Borough.	None stated.	Whilst, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0, 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
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	No consideration has been given to the need to preserve the character of Mayford. It is important for villages to maintain their own identity. Development of these sites will remove the 'green approach' from south of the Borough.	None stated.	Whilst, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0, 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
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	No consideration has been given to the need to preserve the character of Mayford. It is important for villages to maintain their own identity. Development of these sites will remove the 'green approach' from south of the Borough.	None stated.	Whilst, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0, 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
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	No consideration has been given to the need to preserve the character of Mayford. It is important for villages to maintain their own identity. Development of these sites will remove the 'green approach'	None stated.	Whilst, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0, 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				from south of the Borough.		village and Green Belt.	
327	Daniel	Saper	GB7	Historically, planning inspectors have refused proposals for the area as it would reduce the openness of the GB.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	Mayford is unique in the U.K. 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> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	Mayford is unique in the U.K. 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> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	Mayford is unique in the U.K. 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> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	Mayford is unique in the U.K. 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> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	Mayford is unique in the U.K. 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> <p>Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0 and Section 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	Object to the school application, there is no justification for the associated large commercial sports centre. The proposals would exacerbate traffic problems in the area and increase pollution.	None stated.	<p>The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including impact on traffic, noise and vibration and air quality. The conclusion was that these would not have a significant adverse impact or that appropriate mitigation measures could be introduced to address the impact. The Officer report is available online</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	Object to the school application, there is no justification for the associated large commercial sports centre. The proposals would exacerbate traffic problems in the area and increase pollution.	None stated.	<p>The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including impact on traffic, noise and vibration and air quality. The conclusion was that these would not have a significant adverse impact or that appropriate mitigation measures could be introduced to address the impact. The Officer report is available online</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	Object to the school application, there is no justification for the associated large commercial sports centre. The proposals would exacerbate traffic problems in the area and increase pollution.	None stated.	<p>The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including impact on traffic, noise and vibration and air quality. The conclusion was that these would not have a significant adverse impact or that appropriate mitigation measures could be introduced to address the impact. The Officer report is available online</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	Object to the school application, there is no justification for the associated large commercial sports centre. The proposals would exacerbate traffic problems in the area and increase pollution.	None stated.	<p>The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including impact on traffic, noise and vibration and air quality. The conclusion was that these would not have a significant adverse impact or that appropriate mitigation measures could be introduced to address the impact. The Officer report is available online</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	Object to the school application, there is no justification for the associated large commercial sports centre. The proposals would exacerbate traffic problems in the area and increase pollution.	None stated.	<p>The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including impact on traffic, noise and vibration and air quality. The conclusion was that these would not have a significant adverse impact or that appropriate mitigation measures could be introduced to address the impact. The Officer report is available online</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB7	Development in the area will threaten wildlife on Smarts Heath SSSI. The area is also an important open space. The intensification of use on the site will have an impact on wildlife and visual amenity of the area	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	Proposals are likely to have a negative impact on the local economy as it would exacerbate traffic problems and encourage people to go elsewhere	None stated.	<p>The Council's Spatial Vision is set out in the Core Strategy. The vision is for Woking to be a prosperous, vibrant centre which provides a good range of housing, jobs, services and facilities, open spaces and high quality environment. The vision is ambitious and the Core strategy identifies the level of growth that would achieve the vision.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>It is important to note that the reverse of this, i.e. no proposals for growth, would be unlikely to achieve sustainable economic growth either.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0., 20.0 and 24.0</p>	
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	Proposals are likely to have a negative impact on the local economy as it would exacerbate traffic problems and encourage people to go elsewhere	None stated.	<p>The Council's Spatial Vision is set out in the Core Strategy. The vision is for Woking to be a prosperous, vibrant centre which provides a good range of housing, jobs, services and facilities, open spaces and high quality environment. The vision is ambitious and the Core strategy identifies the level of growth that would achieve the vision.</p> <p>It is important to note that the reverse of this, i.e. no proposals for growth, would be unlikely to achieve sustainable economic growth either.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0., 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	Proposals are likely to have a negative impact on the local economy as it would exacerbate traffic problems and encourage people to go elsewhere	None stated.	<p>The Council's Spatial Vision is set out in the Core Strategy. The vision is for Woking to be a prosperous, vibrant centre which provides a good range of housing, jobs, services and facilities, open spaces and high quality environment. The vision is ambitious and the Core strategy identifies the level of growth that would achieve the vision.</p> <p>It is important to note that the reverse of this, i.e. no proposals for growth, would be unlikely to achieve sustainable economic growth either.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0., 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	Proposals are likely to have a negative impact on the local economy as it would exacerbate traffic problems and encourage people to go elsewhere	None stated.	<p>The Council's Spatial Vision is set out in the Core Strategy. The vision is for Woking to be a prosperous, vibrant centre which provides a good range of housing, jobs, services and facilities, open spaces and high quality environment. The vision is ambitious and the Core strategy identifies the level of growth that would achieve the vision.</p> <p>It is important to note that the reverse of this, i.e. no proposals for growth, would be unlikely to achieve sustainable economic growth either.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0., 20.0 and 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	Proposals are likely to have a negative impact on the local economy as it would exacerbate traffic problems and encourage people to go elsewhere	None stated.	This representation 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
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	The development of these areas will lead to the loss of green spaces and an increase in traffic. The increase in traffic will increase air pollution and have a negative impact on health and wellbeing	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	The development of these areas will lead to the loss of green spaces and an increase in traffic. The increase in traffic will increase air pollution and have a negative impact on health and wellbeing	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	The development of these areas will lead to the loss of green spaces and an increase in traffic. The increase in traffic will increase air pollution and have a negative impact on health and wellbeing	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	The development of these areas will lead to the loss of green spaces and an increase in traffic. The increase in traffic will increase air pollution and have a negative impact on health and wellbeing	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	The development of these areas will lead to the loss of green spaces and an increase in traffic. The increase in traffic will increase air pollution and have a negative impact on health and wellbeing	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB8	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure. The road network already suffers, problems will be exacerbated from the new proposals (and schemes currently under construction- Kingsmoor development). At present: -There is regular congestion during peak hours (Sat Nav image provided). -Prey Heath Road is dangerous with no footpaths or lighting	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				-Narrow lanes attract queues -trains and stations are at capacity The proposals will encourage rat running and may lead to people avoiding the area altogether and shopping elsewhere.		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.	
327	Daniel	Saper	GB9	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure. The road network already suffers, problems will be exacerbated from the new proposals (and schemes currently under construction- Kingsmoor development). At present: -There is regular congestion during peak hours (Sat Nav image provided). -Prey Heath Road is dangerous with no footpaths or lighting -Narrow lanes attract queues -trains and stations are at capacity The proposals will encourage rat running and may lead to people avoiding the area altogether and shopping elsewhere.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0 As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB10	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure. The road network already suffers, problems will be exacerbated from the new proposals (and schemes currently under construction- Kingsmoor development). At present: -There is regular congestion during peak hours (Sat Nav image provided). -Prey Heath Road is dangerous with no footpaths or lighting -Narrow lanes attract queues -trains and stations are at capacity The proposals will encourage rat running and may lead to people avoiding the area altogether and shopping elsewhere.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0 As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB11	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure. The road network already suffers, problems will be exacerbated from the new proposals (and schemes currently under construction- Kingsmoor development). At present: -There is regular congestion during peak hours (Sat Nav image provided). -Prey Heath Road is dangerous with no footpaths or lighting -Narrow lanes attract queues -trains and stations are at capacity The proposals will encourage rat running and may lead to people avoiding the area altogether and shopping elsewhere.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0 As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Since the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published Network Rail is developing its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough, as set out in the Wessex Report. Network Rail are currently in the process of increasing the parking provision across a number of stations along this route in order to increase capacity at individual stations and usage of the trains across the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
327	Daniel	Saper	GB14	There appears to be no consideration of the impact to Mayford's transport and highways infrastructure. The road network already suffers, problems will be exacerbated from the new proposals (and schemes currently under construction- Kingsmoor development). At present: -There is regular congestion during peak hours (Sat Nav image provided). -Prey Heath Road is dangerous with no footpaths or lighting	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 20.0 and 24.0 As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is 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
				-Narrow lanes attract queues -trains and stations are at capacity The proposals will encourage rat running and may lead to people avoiding the area altogether and shopping elsewhere.		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.	
874	P	Saper	GB8	Provides fresh air, quiet space and visual beauty for the whole Borough. Loss of Mayford's Green Belt will diminish the character of the whole Borough. Many Woking residents now live in flats and they need easy access to outside space for quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB9	Provides fresh air, quiet space and visual beauty for the whole Borough. Loss of Mayford's Green Belt will diminish the character of the whole Borough. Many Woking residents now live in flats and they need easy access to outside space for quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB10	Provides fresh air, quiet space and visual beauty for the whole Borough. Loss of Mayford's Green Belt will diminish the character of the whole Borough. Many Woking residents now live in flats and they need easy access to outside space for quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB11	Provides fresh air, quiet space and visual beauty for the whole Borough. Loss of Mayford's Green Belt will diminish the character of the whole Borough. Many Woking residents now live in flats and they need easy access to outside space for quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB14	Provides fresh air, quiet space and visual beauty for the whole Borough. Loss of Mayford's Green Belt will diminish the character of the whole Borough. Many Woking residents now live in flats and they need easy access to outside space for quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB7	Provides fresh air, quiet space and visual beauty for the whole Borough. Loss of Mayford's Green Belt will diminish the character of the whole Borough. Many Woking residents now live in flats and they need easy access to outside space for quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB7	The infrastructure cannot support the increase in traffic volume generated by the proposed development. There is already traffic congestion and hard infrastructure traffic mitigation measures will not have an impact. Shoppers will go to Guildford because of Woking's congestion. Moor Lane and Westfield Avenues have already put pressure on the infrastructure. The lanes around Mayford are used for recreation.	None stated.	This representation 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
874	P	Saper	GB8	The infrastructure cannot support the increase in traffic volume generated by the proposed development. There is already traffic congestion and hard infrastructure traffic mitigation measures will not have an impact. Shoppers will go to Guildford because of Woking's congestion. Moor Lane and Westfield Avenues have already put pressure on the infrastructure. The lanes around Mayford are used for recreation.	None stated.	The representation 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	No further modification is 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.	
874	P	Saper	GB9	The infrastructure cannot support the increase in traffic volume generated by the proposed development. There is already traffic congestion and hard infrastructure traffic mitigation measures will not have an impact. Shoppers will go to Guildford because of Woking's congestion. Moor Lane and Westfield Avenues have already put pressure on the infrastructure. The lanes around Mayford are used for recreation.	None stated.	<p>The representation 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 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
874	P	Saper	GB10	The infrastructure cannot support the increase in traffic volume generated by the proposed development. There is already traffic congestion and hard infrastructure traffic mitigation measures will not have an impact. Shoppers will go to Guildford because of Woking's congestion. Moor Lane and Westfield Avenues have already put pressure on the infrastructure. The lanes around Mayford are used for recreation.	None stated.	<p>The representation 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 A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
874	P	Saper	GB11	The infrastructure cannot support the increase in traffic volume generated by the proposed development. There is already traffic congestion and hard infrastructure traffic mitigation measures will not have an impact. Shoppers will go to Guildford because of Woking's congestion. Moor Lane and Westfield Avenues have already put pressure on the infrastructure. The lanes around Mayford are used for recreation.	None stated.	<p>The representation 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 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
874	P	Saper	GB14	The infrastructure cannot support the increase in traffic volume generated by the proposed development. There is already traffic congestion and hard infrastructure traffic mitigation measures will not have an impact. Shoppers will go to Guildford because of Woking's congestion. Moor Lane and Westfield Avenues have already put pressure on the infrastructure. The lanes around Mayford are used for recreation.	None stated.	<p>The representation 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 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
874	P	Saper	GB7	Prey and Smarts Heath are precious and easily damaged and will be threatened due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
874	P	Saper	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are precious and easily damaged and will be threatened due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are precious and easily damaged and will be threatened due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are precious and easily damaged and will be threatened due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are precious and easily damaged and will be threatened due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new</p>	No further modification is 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 biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
874	P	Saper	GB14	Prey and Smarts Heath are precious and easily damaged and will be threatened due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB7	There is no demand for a new sports centre. It will generate congestion, noise and the loss of valued green environment.	None stated.	Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB8	There is no demand for a new sports centre. It will generate congestion, noise and the loss of valued green environment.	None stated.	Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB9	There is no demand for a new sports centre. It will generate congestion, noise and the loss of valued green environment.	None stated.	Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB10	There is no demand for a new sports centre. It will generate congestion, noise and the loss of valued green environment.	None stated.	Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB11	There is no demand for a new sports centre. It will generate congestion, noise and the loss of valued green environment.	None stated.	Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB14	There is no demand for a new sports centre. It will generate congestion, noise and the loss of valued green environment.	None stated.	Planning permission has been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site. The issues raised will have been considered and addressed as part of the planning application and can be viewed in the Officer's Report for the application.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB7	The purpose of the green belt in Mayford is even more relevant today and should be preserved for the Borough. Mayford is not suitable for development because of the fragile heathlands and valued green space and unsuitable roads. Congestion is already severe and more development will compromise Woking's attractiveness for businesses.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB8	The purpose of the green belt in Mayford is even more relevant today and should be preserved for the Borough. Mayford is not suitable for development because of the fragile heathlands and valued green space and unsuitable roads. Congestion is already severe and more development will compromise Woking's attractiveness for businesses.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	
874	P	Saper	GB9	The purpose of the green belt in Mayford is even more relevant today and should be preserved for the Borough. Mayford is not suitable for development because of the fragile heathlands and valued green space and unsuitable roads. Congestion is already severe and more development will compromise Woking's attractiveness for businesses.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB10	The purpose of the green belt in Mayford is even more relevant today and should be preserved for the Borough. Mayford is not suitable for development because of the fragile heathlands and valued green space and unsuitable roads. Congestion is already severe and more development will compromise Woking's attractiveness for businesses.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB11	The purpose of the green belt in Mayford is even more relevant today and should be preserved for the Borough. Mayford is not suitable for development because of the fragile heathlands and valued green space and unsuitable roads. Congestion is already severe and more development will compromise Woking's attractiveness for businesses.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB14	The purpose of the green belt in Mayford is even more relevant today and should be preserved for the Borough. Mayford is not suitable for development because of the fragile heathlands and valued green space and unsuitable roads. Congestion is already severe and more development will compromise Woking's attractiveness for businesses.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 10.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB7	Is an attractive green entry route to the town for drivers.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB8	Is an attractive green entry route to the town for drivers.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB9	Is an attractive green entry route to the town for drivers.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB10	Is an attractive green entry route to the town for drivers.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB11	Is an attractive green entry route to the town for drivers.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB14	Is an attractive green entry route to the town for drivers.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB7	Objects to development on the Green Belt in Mayford. The original purpose of the Green Belt to provide a green space to city residents remains relevant.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
874	P	Saper	GB8	Objects to development on the Green Belt in Mayford. The original purpose of the Green Belt to provide a green space to city residents remains relevant.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB9	Objects to development on the Green Belt in Mayford. The original purpose of the Green Belt to provide a green space to city residents remains relevant.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB10	Objects to development on the Green Belt in Mayford. The original purpose of the Green Belt to provide a green space to city residents remains relevant.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB11	Objects to development on the Green Belt in Mayford. The original purpose of the Green Belt to provide a green space to city residents remains relevant.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB14	Objects to development on the Green Belt in Mayford. The original purpose of the Green Belt to provide a green space to city residents remains relevant.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB7	Worplesden Station at peak times is congested. The trains and car park are full.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB8	Worplesden Station at peak times is congested. The trains and car park are full.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB9	Worplesden Station at peak times is congested. The trains and car park are full.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.	
874	P	Saper	GB10	Worplesden Station at peak times is congested. The trains and car park are full.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB11	Worplesden Station at peak times is congested. The trains and car park are full.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
874	P	Saper	GB14	Worplesden Station at peak times is congested. The trains and car park are full.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations.</p> <p>As noted within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6, the Council is working with the County Council to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
386	S	Sarson	GB10	There is no exceptional circumstances for releasing the GB for 1200 homes between 2027-2040.	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
386	S	Sarson	GB11	There is no exceptional circumstances for releasing the GB for 1200 homes between 2027-2040.	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
386	S	Sarson	GB14	There is no exceptional circumstances for releasing the GB for 1200 homes between 2027-2040.	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
386	S	Sarson	GB10	The local transport infrastructure, including Egley Road has insufficient capacity to accommodate the extra traffic	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
386	S	Sarson	GB11	The local transport infrastructure, including Egley Road has insufficient capacity to accommodate the extra traffic	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
386	S	Sarson	GB14	The local transport infrastructure, including Egley Road has insufficient capacity to accommodate the extra traffic	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
386	S	Sarson	GB10	Object to proposals to release GB land in GB10, GB11 and GB14. Proposals will increase urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
386	S	Sarson	GB11	Object to proposals to release GB land in GB10, GB11 and GB14. Proposals will increase urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
386	S	Sarson	GB14	Object to proposals to release GB land in GB10, GB11 and GB14. Proposals will increase urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
928		Satchithananda	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The Council consultation has been poorly communicated, the deadline is too soon and should be extended.	None stated.	Objection is noted. With regards to the representation regarding the consultation process please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
928		Satchithananda	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The Council consultation has been poorly communicated, the deadline is too soon and should be extended.	None stated.	Objection is noted. With regards to the representation regarding the consultation process please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
928		Satchithananda	GB12	Concerned for the safety of the pupils of Pyrford Primary School as there are no plans to improve parking or road infrastructure. There is no controlled crossing outside the Village Hall which is used by local groups and children. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse, increasing the chance for incidents.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport, existing traffic congestion and safety impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
928		Satchithananda	GB13	Concerned for the safety of the pupils of Pyrford Primary School as there are no plans to improve parking or road infrastructure. There is no controlled crossing outside the Village Hall which is used by local groups and children. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse, increasing the chance for incidents.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by	No further modification is 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 Local Planning Authority would recommend highlighting the current parking situation to the County Highways Authority and Woking Borough Council Parking Services to try and address the current situation.</p>	
928		Satchithananda	GB12	<p>The road network will be unable to cope from further development.</p> <p>The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.</p> <p>Parking in Waitrose has become congested.</p> <p>Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.</p> <p>Existing house prices are likely to fall, will the Council compensate?</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>As part of site UA51, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of part of the centre of West Byfleet. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development such as site UA51 comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of the village and the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding property values is not a planning consideration.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
928		Satchithananda	GB13	<p>The road network will be unable to cope from further development.</p> <p>The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long</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>waiting times for doctor appointments. Parking in Waitrose has become congested. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Existing house prices are likely to fall, will the Council compensate?</p>		<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>As part of site UA51, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of part of the centre of West Byfleet. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development such as site UA51 comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of the village and the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and 1.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding property values is not a planning consideration.</p>	
928		Satchithananda	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford as they will alter the village character of the area. Site release not recommended in GBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
928		Satchithananda	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford as they will alter the village character of the area. Site release not recommended in GBR.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
82	Paul	Saunders	GB12	The sites are designated Green Belt. The classification restricts development here. Therefore objects to substantial residential development here.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
82	Paul	Saunders	GB12	Pyrford needs to retain all the current green spaces and this can only be achieved by preserving the GB	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
82	Paul	Saunders	GB12	The proposals in Pyrford should be rejected and the land retained for the benefit of the community, natural environment and preserving the rural lancape	None stated.	The Council accepts the character of Pyrford is distinctive to be protected. However, it is satisfied that it will not be compromised by the proposals. The 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
82	Paul	Saunders	GB12	The proposals fail to appreciate the importance of the GB, in a country suffering from overdevelopment	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
82	Paul	Saunders	GB13	The sites are designated Green Belt. The classification restricts development here. Therefore objects to substantial residential development here.	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
82	Paul	Saunders	GB13	Pyrford needs to retain all the current green spaces and this can only be achieved by preserving the GB	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
82	Paul	Saunders	GB13	The proposals in Pyrford should be rejected and the land retained for the benefit of the community, natural environment and preserving the rural lancape	None stated.	The Council accepts the character of Pyrford is distinctive to be protected. However, it is satisfied that it will not be compromised by the proposals. The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
82	Paul	Saunders	GB13	The proposals fail to appreciate the importance of the GB, in a country suffering from overdevelopment	None stated.	The protection of the Green Belt is an important objective of the Green Belt. The Council believes that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
199	B	Saunders	GB12	The proposals will destroy the semi-rural environment and views.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
199	B	Saunders	GB13	The proposals will destroy the semi-rural environment and views.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
199	B	Saunders	GB12	The Green Belt around Pyrford needs to be preserved from proposals that would erode green space and conflict with Green Belt principles. I object.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village. The council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
199	B	Saunders	GB12	The Green Belt around Pyrford needs to be preserved from proposals that would erode green space and conflict with Green Belt principles. I object.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues	No further modification is 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 Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village. The council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites to meet the development needs of the area. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period.	
199	B	Saunders	GB13	The Green Belt around Pyrford needs to be preserved from proposals that would erode green space and conflict with Green Belt principles. I object.	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
199	B	Saunders	GB13	The Green Belt around Pyrford needs to be preserved from proposals that would erode green space and conflict with Green Belt principles. I object.	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
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB12	Very concerned as at present infrastructure falls far short of needs; a further 433 homes will destroy the area. Expert reports have already said the land is not appropriate for large scale development, why have these reports have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The 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
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB13	Very concerned as at present infrastructure falls far short of needs; a further 433 homes will destroy the area. Expert reports have already said the land is not appropriate for large scale development, why have these reports have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						standards of provision in the area. 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.	
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB13	Concern for local amenities - water pressure already very poor. What investment is going to be made to improve this and to support all extra homes?	None stated.	The Council has carried out an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to assess the scale of infrastructure needed to support development. There will be sufficient water to support the projected growth. The Council also has robust policies such as Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy to minimise water consumption of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB12	Concern for local amenities - water pressure already very poor. What investment is going to be made to improve this and to support all extra homes?	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the overall development in the area. Based on the evidence, there is be sufficient water to support the projected growth. Nevertheless, the Council has robust policies such as Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy to minimise water consumption as a result of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB12	How many more police officers will the area get? Will the traffic situation around Pyrford Primary school be addressed? I can see these problems will continue to be ignored. Obviously we all hate development to the area we live and I understand the need to house the increasing population. It will be terribly sad to destroy the rural feeling of the area. However the present population should not suffer because of that need. Other areas already have the infrastructure in place or can be with a small investment. A huge investment is needed make Pyrford viable for development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB13	How many more police officers will the area get? Will the traffic situation around Pyrford Primary school be addressed? I can see these problems will continue to be ignored. Obviously we all hate development to the area we live and I understand the need to house the increasing population. It will be terribly sad to destroy the rural feeling of the area. However the present population should not suffer because of that need. Other areas already have the infrastructure in place or can be with a small investment. A huge investment is needed make Pyrford viable for development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB12	Various infrastructure issues to be rectified before can consider development of GB12 and GB13. Where are the additional places for primary or secondary age children going to be found? Pyrford Primary school is being rebuilt but without additional places.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB13	Various infrastructure issues to be rectified before can consider development of GB12 and GB13. Where are the additional places for primary or secondary age children going to be found? Pyrford Primary school is being rebuilt but without additional places.	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
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB12	The present road system does not support the existing traffic accessing the A3 or at school pick up and drop off times. Trains are already crowded, where do the additional passengers go.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1140	Graham	Saunders	GB13	The present road system does not support the existing traffic accessing the A3 or at school pick up and drop off times. Trains are already crowded, where do the additional passengers go.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	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
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
231	Mary	Sawyer	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
231	Mary	Sawyer	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 Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	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
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution toward the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD		
231	Mary	Sawyer	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
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt. However no urban sites appear to have been considered - there must be doubt as to the validity of no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable. Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to sites on the edge of the urban area that benefit from good access to jobs, shops and other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria. The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside the owners' immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations. No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB8	Whilst in principle I recognise the requirement for a secondary school could be a 'very special circumstance' to build in the Green Belt, housing and sports/leisure facilities should not. Especially as other facilities close by which would become semi redundant.	Remove the requirements for housing and additional sports / leisure facilities (other than those required for school purposes) from the site details contained in	The school and leisure centre now has planning permission. The justification for the use of Green Belt land for housing is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the Draft DPD and associated documentation . Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.		
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB9	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB14	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB10	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB11	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
231	Mary	Sawyer	GB8	Separation between Woking and Mayford must be maintained, in line with the Core Strategy and NPPF. A single row of trees is insufficient. The existing heathland/meadow/woodland should be retained.	Remove the requirements for housing and additional sports / leisure facilities (other than those required for school purposes) from the site details contained in the Draft DPD	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	No further modification is 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 associated documentation . Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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.	
231	Mary	Sawyer	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	General	I appreciate that special circumstances will exist for the development of schools and the only deliverable areas for these are likely to be on the Green Belt, however duplicate sports facilities are not required and will undermine the usage of existing sites. The need for any additional accommodation for their residents should be outweighed by the needs of existing residents.	None stated.	The proposed school at site GB8 now has the benefit of planning approval. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the DPD	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,	
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	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 Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	General	There is currently an even distribution of electorate within the ward; an overdevelopment south of Woking would upset this balance, straining infrastructure and services. The draft Sustainability Appraisal Report warns about these dangers.	None stated.	The allocated sites are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution toward 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 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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	General	The draft DPD goes too far in addressing sites for future developments; far more effort should be implemented to make better use of existing urban, brownfield, derelict and underused areas. Developments in the Green Belt should only occur where extremely special circumstances exist.	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. In addition to development that has taken place and those likely to come forward in the urban area, there will still be the need to identify Green Belt land to meet future development needs. A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out to ensure that the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposals are taken into account and any adverse impacts minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	General	Whilst appreciating that over the last 20 years Woking Borough has endeavoured to fulfil the need for additional housing using the existing stock of brownfield, derelict or unused sites and that the majority of these have now been developed, there is a perception that more and more housing is needed and the only option is Green Belt. This is urban sprawl that will irreversibly reduce the natural environment, merge villages, losing identity, facilities and amenity for residents.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
232	Glenn	Sawyer	General	No justification for the loss of heathland, farmland and woods, impacting the attenuation of surface water and affecting the flood plain, or for the current trend of exchanging one area of greenery for another (offsetting), just to enable developers the opportunity to exploit significant revenue from preferred locations.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a Habitats Regulations Assessment to make sure that important habitats of European importance are protected. The most versatile agricultural land are not allocated. A sequential test has been carried out to minimise any risk of flooding. The allocations are in Flood Zone 1 where development is directed. The Council is satisfied that the key requirements of the allocations will enable the sustainable development of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt. However no urban sites appear to have been considered - there must be doubt as to the validity of no other sites across the whole of the Borough being identified or suitable. Where no sites are available in the urban area, priority will be given to sites on the edge of the urban area that benefit from good access to jobs, shops and other infrastructure and services. Mayford does not satisfy any of these criteria. The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside the owners' immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations. No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB8	Whilst in principle I recognise the requirement for a secondary school could be a 'very special circumstance' to build in the Green Belt, housing and sports/leisure facilities should not. Especially as other facilities close by which would become semi redundant.	Remove the requirements for housing and additional sports / leisure facilities (other than those required for school purposes) from the site details contained in	The school and leisure centre now has planning permission. The justification for the use of Green Belt land for housing is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the Draft DPD and associated documentation . Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.		
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB11	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB14	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB9	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB10	A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. New buildings should be regarded as 'inappropriate'. The NPPF also states the five 5 purposes of Green Belt. The CPRE describes the Green Belt as a buffer between towns and countryside. The DPD proposals fall do not adhere to these policies and guidance. The unmet need for additional housing - including for Traveller sites - is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt to constitute the 'very special circumstances' needed to justify inappropriate development.	These Green Belt areas should not be used to provide the housing detailed within the draft DPD and associated documentation for the period up to 2040 and beyond. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
232	Glenn	Sawyer	GB8	Separation between Woking and Mayford must be maintained, in line with the Core Strategy and NPPF. A single row of trees is insufficient. The existing heathland/meadow/woodland should be retained.	Remove the requirements for housing and additional sports / leisure facilities (other than those required for school purposes) from the site details contained in the Draft DPD	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	No further modification is 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 associated documentation . Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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.	
232	Glenn	Sawyer	General	The statements of the Core Strategy vision are true now, but if the DPD moves forward in its current direction these statements are at risk for being inaccurate.	None stated.	The proposals in the site Allocations DPD are not at odds with the vision of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy specifically requires the Council to identify land in the Green Belt to meet future development needs. The allocations are in general conformity with both national policy and the policies of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
232	Glenn	Sawyer	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
184	J	Scott	GB7	An increase in Traveller caravans would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other 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
184	J	Scott	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.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The character of Mayford is already protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council is satisfied by the evidence and policies it has that the identity of Mayford and its character will not be undermined by the proposals. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. This matter has been comprehensively been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution toward the Traveller community. No justification	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The	No further modification is 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 further expansion in Mayford.		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.	
184	J	Scott	GB8	Strongly object to associated leisure centre, running track, football and other sports pitches, cafe, associated car parking and access provisions. Totally inappropriate development in residential area. Do not meet 800m separation policy. There would be substantial traffic increase on already overloaded road system, especially at peak times. Unfortunate lack of transparency by the Council.	None stated.	The proposed school and leisure centre now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating that it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking (estimated using Google Maps timings). At peak hours actual travel time is over half an hour. Mayford has a poor road network that is heavily congested at peak times. Many of the roads do not have pavements and are narrow, including the road to Worplesdon Station. Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Development will exacerbate this.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB8	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic. Worplesdon rail station would notice a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
184	J	Scott	GB9	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with roads unable to handle additional traffic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The way that the transport implications for the DPD proposals are addressed is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Lancaple Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancaple importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancaple Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancaple importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancaple Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancaple importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancaple Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancaple importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green	No further modification is 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 boundary will not change in this particular location.	
184	J	Scott	GB10	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB8	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB9	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites as they are 'Important Bird Areas'. The Mayford Village Society is pursuing this and will result in development not being allowed within 400m.	None stated.	The 400m exclusion zone from the SPA is justified by Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy and the Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. It relates to designated SPAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that Mayford Village Society is pursuing the designation of Prey Heath and Smart Heath as SPA, there is no confirmation of such designation. Consequently, it cannot be given the same policy status as SPA. The site continues to be accorded the status as an SSSI, which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB10	The GBBR is inconsistent in its approach to identifying sites with constraints and then recommending them to be developed. This includes Ten Acres as a Travellers Site.	None stated.	The Council do not see any inconsistency in its approach to identifying sites to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB9	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in the review. The Council does not think its decisions has also been inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB11	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB10	Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB11	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to	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.		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
184	J	Scott	GB9	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
184	J	Scott	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. 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
184	J	Scott	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						species and habitats, as set out in 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.	
184	J	Scott	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.	None stated.	Support for the school is noted. It now has planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB11	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.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB8	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.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB9	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.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB10	I strongly object to proposed housing. Development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, making Mayford 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. Development will have a disproportionate and unjustifiable impact on residents who chose to live in a semi-rural not urban environment.	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
184	J	Scott	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>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>		<p>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.</p>	
184	J	Scott	GB8	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.</p> <p>Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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</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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Mayford is 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.			
184	J	Scott	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by the Council, especially as Policy states that housing need including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will effectively become 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. The Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land 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. The owner status of sites has not influenced decision on the DPD. This matter is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 13.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB11	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on field either side later on.	None stated.	The Council has always been clear that the Egley Road site is allocated for a school and residential development. The school now has the benefit of planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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 field either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The Hoe Valley School has the benefit of planning approval. Proposal GB8 has always been clear that the allocation is for the purposes of a school and residential development. The release of the site for development is justified by special circumstances. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There are no sufficient brownfield land to meet the needs of the entire Core Strategy period. This matter comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The allocation of Egley Road site for housing is therefore justified.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB8	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on field either side later on.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB9	The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on field either side later on.	None stated.	The school has planning permission. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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. Please reconsider, the plans will have a devastating impact on this unique historic village. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		<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.</p>	
184	J	Scott	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.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	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	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Prey Heath Road and Saunders Lane are unsuitable.		<p>proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>	
184	J	Scott	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.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
184	J	Scott	GB7	Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools. It does not have easy access to local facilities required for a Traveller site.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
309	Peter	Scott	GB16	The plans don't take into consideration the impact the proposals would have on the local infrastructure. Local roads, rail, heath and education facilities can not support the development proposed	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
309	Peter	Scott	GB15	The plans don't take into consideration the impact the proposals would have on the local infrastructure. Local roads, rail, heath and education facilities can not support the development proposed	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding local infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
309	Peter	Scott	GB16	Parvis Road is at capacity and cannot support more growth proposed here	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
309	Peter	Scott	GB15	Parvis Road is at capacity and cannot support more growth proposed here	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
309	Peter	Scott	GB15	The release of GB at GB15 and GB16 will lead to urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
309	Peter	Scott	GB16	The release of GB at GB15 and GB16 will lead to urban sprawl	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
309	Peter	Scott	GB15	Development of GB15 and GB16 will result in 80% of GB in the Ward compared with others. This is not acceptable	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
309	Peter	Scott	GB16	Development of GB15 and GB16 will result in 80% of GB in the Ward compared with others. This is not acceptable	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
491	Martin	Scott	GB12	Opposed developments planned for Pyrford. Pyrford is currently distinguishable from Woking due to the green unspoilt land separating the two communities. This oasis of green will be lost, Pyrford will lose its village feel and become part of Woking's urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 23.0, 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
491	Martin	Scott	GB13	Opposed developments planned for Pyrford. Pyrford is currently distinguishable from Woking due to the green unspoilt land separating the two communities. This oasis of green will be lost, Pyrford will lose its village feel and become part of Woking's urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 15.0 and 23.0, 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
491	Martin	Scott	GB12	Hopes WBC can give this thought and suggest brownfield sites for construction of new housing.	None stated.	The Council has considered a wide range of sites, including previously developed land. This is set out in 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 existing urban area for development and these sites are anticipated to deliver a significant amount of development over the Plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
491	Martin	Scott	GB13	Hopes WBC can give this thought and suggest brownfield sites for construction of new housing.	None stated.	The Council has considered a wide range of sites, including previously developed land. This is set out in 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 existing urban area for development and these sites are anticipated to deliver a significant amount of development over the Plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1091	Robert	Scott	GB13	Development will destroy the local environment and community spirit. I know the world can't stand still but can it not move forward with a little more grace and sympathy? 400 plus properties would not be in keeping with the area. I would not object to a more sensible plan (100/150 properties). I hope sanity prevails!	None stated.	The Council will ensure that any development that comes forward is of high quality design and environmental standards. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
1091	Robert	Scott	GB12	Development will destroy the local environment and community spirit. I know the world can't stand still but can it not move forward with a little more grace and sympathy? 400 plus properties would not be in keeping with the area. I would not object to a more sensible plan (100/150 properties). I hope sanity prevails!	None stated.	The proposals are necessary to meet the locally identified development needs of the area. The identified needs have been through extensive community consultation and public examination before they were adopted in the Core Strategy. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1091	Robert	Scott	GB12	Local roads would see a big uplift in traffic. This will have a negative impact on quality of life and create chaos outside the primary school.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1091	Robert	Scott	GB13	Local roads would see a big uplift in traffic. This will have a negative impact on quality of life and create chaos outside the primary school.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1091	Robert	Scott	GB12	I object to development at Upshot Lane. It would be a huge shame to have the reason I moved here destroyed by over-development. The development is excessive. There is inadequate infrastructure to support this. School places are already under pressure, this will 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
1091	Robert	Scott	GB13	I object to development at Upshot Lane. It would be a huge shame to have the reason I moved here destroyed by over-development. The development is excessive. There is inadequate infrastructure to support this. School places are already under pressure, this will 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
1127	Lisa	Scott	GB12	Please accept this as a firm objection to the proposed plan. A Pyrford walk features in the book 'Surrey walks', a lovely well used footpath and bridleway alongside one of the fiel proposed to be built upon. I am well aware of the housing shortage in the UK but urge you to reconsider these plans. Pyrford's infrastructure cannot cope with this volume of housing (schools, GP surgeries, roads would be in gridlock). Keep Pyrford a special part of Surrey Green Belt, do not ruin this community or beautiful countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1127	Lisa	Scott	GB12	Please accept this as a firm objection to the proposed plan. A Pyrford walk features in the book 'Surrey walks', a lovely well used footpath and bridleway alongside one of the fiel proposed to be built upon. I am well aware of the housing shortage in the UK but urge you to reconsider these plans. Pyrford's infrastructure cannot cope with this volume of housing (schools, GP surgeries, roads would be in gridlock). Keep Pyrford a special part of Surrey Green Belt, do not ruin this community or beautiful countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1127	Lisa	Scott	GB13	Please accept this as a firm objection to the proposed plan. A Pyrford walk features in the book 'Surrey walks', a lovely well used footpath and bridleway alongside one of the fiel	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposed to be built upon. I am well aware of the housing shortage in the UK but urge you to reconsider these plans. Pyrford's infrastructure cannot cope with this volume of housing (schools, GP surgeries, roads would be in gridlock). Keep Pyrford a special part of Surrey Green Belt, do not ruin this community or beautiful countryside.		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.	
1127	Lisa	Scott	GB13	Please accept this as a firm objection to the proposed plan. A Pyrford walk features in the book 'Surrey walks', a lovely well used footpath and bridleway alongside one of the fiel proposed to be built upon. I am well aware of the housing shortage in the UK but urge you to reconsider these plans. Pyrford's infrastructure cannot cope with this volume of housing (schools, GP surgeries, roads would be in gridlock). Keep Pyrford a special part of Surrey Green Belt, do not ruin this community or beautiful countryside.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. 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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB7	Green Belt boundaries were originally set down to safeguard the country's rural towns and villages from urbanisation. Any relaxation of boundaries will ultimately lead to the whole area losing its rural identity, to the detriment of the whole borough in the long term.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 23.0. It is arguable whether the Borough on the whole has a rural identity, and the majority of its population lives in the urban area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB8	Green Belt boundaries were originally set down to safeguard the country's rural towns and villages from urbanisation. Any relaxation of boundaries will ultimately lead to the whole area losing its rural identity, to the detriment of the whole borough in the long term.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. 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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB9	Green Belt boundaries were originally set down to safeguard the country's rural towns and villages from urbanisation. Any relaxation of boundaries will ultimately lead to the whole area losing its rural identity, to the detriment of the whole borough in the long term.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. 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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB10	Green Belt boundaries were originally set down to safeguard the country's rural towns and villages from urbanisation. Any relaxation of boundaries will ultimately lead to the whole area losing its rural identity, to the detriment of the whole borough in the long term.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. 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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB11	Green Belt boundaries were originally set down to safeguard the country's rural towns and villages from urbanisation. Any relaxation of boundaries will ultimately lead to the whole area losing its rural identity, to the detriment of the whole borough in the long term.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1381	Paul	Scott	GB14	Green Belt boundaries were originally set down to safeguard the country's rural towns and villages from urbanisation. Any relaxation of boundaries will ultimately lead to the whole area losing its rural identity, to the detriment of the whole borough in the long term.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. 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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB7	Objects and is concerned about the reduction in the Green Belt in and around Mayford. The proposals will join Woking and Guildford and change the dynamics of village life entirely.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB8	Objects and is concerned about the reduction in the Green Belt in and around Mayford. The proposals will join Woking and Guildford and change the dynamics of village life entirely.	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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB9	Objects and is concerned about the reduction in the Green Belt in and around Mayford. The proposals will join Woking and Guildford and change the dynamics of village life entirely.	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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB10	Objects and is concerned about the reduction in the Green Belt in and around Mayford. The proposals will join Woking and Guildford and change the dynamics of village life entirely.	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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB11	Objects and is concerned about the reduction in the Green Belt in and around Mayford. The proposals will join Woking and Guildford and change the dynamics of village life entirely.	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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB14	Objects and is concerned about the reduction in the Green Belt in and around Mayford. The proposals will join Woking and Guildford and change the dynamics of village life entirely.	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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB7	The Government's priority is for redevelopment of brownfield sites over Green Belt land. Questions if the Council has independently verified research to show 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
1381	Paul	Scott	GB8	The Government's priority is for redevelopment of brownfield sites over Green Belt land. Questions if the Council has independently verified research to show that all brownfield sites have been exhausted?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB9	The Government's priority is for redevelopment of brownfield sites over Green Belt land. Questions if the Council has independently verified research to show that all brownfield sites have been exhausted?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB10	The Government's priority is for redevelopment of brownfield sites over Green Belt land. Questions if the Council has independently verified research to show that all brownfield sites have been exhausted?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB11	The Government's priority is for redevelopment of brownfield sites over Green Belt land. Questions if the Council has independently verified research to show that all brownfield sites have been exhausted?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB14	The Government's priority is for redevelopment of brownfield sites over Green Belt land. Questions if the Council has independently verified research to show that all brownfield sites have been exhausted?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB7	Recent decisions by neighbouring Guildford and Mole Valley Councils to uphold the original Green Belt and investigate other options set a strong precedent of how Councils should react in the interest of their own residents and communities	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				view and well being.		through the plan-making, and provide specific local circumstances to justify Green Belt release. This will undoubtedly differ between other local authorities, who will be working with differing evidence and levels of development need on which to make decisions.	
1381	Paul	Scott	GB8	Recent decisions by neighbouring Guildford and Mole Valley Councils to uphold the original Green Belt and investigate other options set a strong precedent of how Councils should react in the interest of their own residents and communities view and well being.	None stated.	The Council is aware of adjoining authorities and of any progress being made on their Local Development Documents. Nevertheless, the Council has an adopted Core Strategy which it is committed to deliver and programme to deliver it (L). A Duty to Cooperate 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 adjoining authorities, local residents and key stakeholders in the preparation of the DPD	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB9	Recent decisions by neighbouring Guildford and Mole Valley Councils to uphold the original Green Belt and investigate other options set a strong precedent of how Councils should react in the interest of their own residents and communities view and well being.	None stated.	The Council is aware of adjoining authorities and of any progress being made on their Local Development Documents. Nevertheless, the Council has an adopted Core Strategy which it is committed to deliver and programme to deliver it (L). A Duty to Cooperate 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 adjoining authorities, local residents and key stakeholders in the preparation of the DPD	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB10	Recent decisions by neighbouring Guildford and Mole Valley Councils to uphold the original Green Belt and investigate other options set a strong precedent of how Councils should react in the interest of their own residents and communities view and well being.	None stated.	The Council is aware of adjoining authorities and of any progress being made on their Local Development Documents. Nevertheless, the Council has an adopted Core Strategy which it is committed to deliver and programme to deliver it (L). A Duty to Cooperate 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 adjoining authorities, local residents and key stakeholders in the preparation of the DPD	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB11	Recent decisions by neighbouring Guildford and Mole Valley Councils to uphold the original Green Belt and investigate other options set a strong precedent of how Councils should react in the interest of their own residents and communities view and well being.	None stated.	The Council is aware of adjoining authorities and of any progress being made on their Local Development Documents. Nevertheless, the Council has an adopted Core Strategy which it is committed to deliver and programme to deliver it (L). A Duty to Cooperate 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 adjoining authorities, local residents and key stakeholders in the preparation of the DPD	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB14	Recent decisions by neighbouring Guildford and Mole Valley Councils to uphold the original Green Belt and investigate other options set a strong precedent of how Councils should react in the interest of their own residents and communities view and well being.	None stated.	The Council is aware of adjoining authorities and of any progress being made on their Local Development Documents. Nevertheless, the Council has an adopted Core Strategy which it is committed to deliver and programme to deliver it (L). A Duty to Cooperate 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 adjoining authorities, local residents and key stakeholders in the preparation of the DPD	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB7	The existing infrastructure is the area of unsuitable for sustaining population growth and transportation. Country lanes would need widening and the intensity of traffic on already overstretched roads between Woking and Guildford would cause gridlock.	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. Please refer to paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper with regard to traffic and road infrastructure. Section 3.0 of this paper covers infrastructure provision more generally.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB8	The existing infrastructure is the area of unsuitable for sustaining population growth and transportation. Country lanes would need widening and the intensity of traffic on already overstretched roads between Woking and Guildford would cause gridlock.	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. Please refer to paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper with regard to traffic and road infrastructure. Section 3.0 of this paper covers infrastructure provision	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						more generally.	
1381	Paul	Scott	GB9	The existing infrastructure is the area of unsuitable for sustaining population growth and transportation. Country lanes would need widening and the intensity of traffic on already overstretched roads between Woking and Guildford would cause gridlock.	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 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.</p> <p>Please refer to paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper with regard to traffic and road infrastructure. Section 3.0 of this paper covers infrastructure provision more generally.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB10	The existing infrastructure is the area of unsuitable for sustaining population growth and transportation. Country lanes would need widening and the intensity of traffic on already overstretched roads between Woking and Guildford would cause gridlock.	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 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.</p> <p>Please refer to paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper with regard to traffic and road infrastructure. Section 3.0 of this paper covers infrastructure provision more generally.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB11	The existing infrastructure is the area of unsuitable for sustaining population growth and transportation. Country lanes would need widening and the intensity of traffic on already overstretched roads between Woking and Guildford would cause gridlock.	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 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.</p> <p>Please refer to paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper with regard to traffic and road infrastructure. Section 3.0 of this paper covers infrastructure provision more generally.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB14	The existing infrastructure is the area of unsuitable for sustaining population growth and transportation. Country lanes would need widening and the intensity of traffic on already overstretched roads between Woking and Guildford would cause gridlock.	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 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.</p> <p>Please refer to paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper with regard to traffic and road infrastructure. Section 3.0 of this paper covers infrastructure provision more generally.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB7	States his intended active support in stopping the erosion of the Green Belt, not just locally but nationally, as the destiny of the country for future generations is at stake.	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:</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1381	Paul	Scott	GB8	States his intended active support in stopping the erosion of the Green belt, not just locally but nationally, as the destiny of the country for future generations is at stake.	None stated.	Objection is noted. However please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 where the matter has been comprehensively addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB9	States his intended active support in stopping the erosion of the Green belt, not just locally but nationally, as the destiny of the country for future generations is at stake.	None stated.	Objection is noted. However please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 where the matter has been comprehensively addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB10	States his intended active support in stopping the erosion of the Green belt, not just locally but nationally, as the destiny of the country for future generations is at stake.	None stated.	Objection is noted. However please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 where the matter has been comprehensively addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB11	States his intended active support in stopping the erosion of the Green belt, not just locally but nationally, as the destiny of the country for future generations is at stake.	None stated.	Objection is noted. However please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 where the matter has been comprehensively addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1381	Paul	Scott	GB14	States his intended active support in stopping the erosion of the Green belt, not just locally but nationally, as the destiny of the country for future generations is at stake.	None stated.	Objection is noted. However please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 where the matter has been comprehensively addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB8	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB9	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the 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
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB10	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB11	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Heath Road will become dangerous.		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	
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB10	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2	
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB8	Wildlife in the developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB9	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB10	Wildlife in the developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB11	Wildlife in the developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB7	Mayford already provides a major contribution toward the Traveller Community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	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
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Increased use of the site would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	The allocation of Ten Acres to provide pitches is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
7	Barry	Scrivner	General	Please reconsider your plans which will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a village, which is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. I am happy that the Mayford Village Society also represents my views.	Reconsider your plans.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 12. The Core Strategy includes specific policies to protect the character of Mayford (Policy CS6). It is accepted that the proposals will introduce change in the general vicinity of Mayford. However, it expected that they will not unacceptably undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB8	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB9	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB10	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the	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,	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
				character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.		2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area.	of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB11	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford, on the character of the village, the loss of green space and increased risk of merging of Woking with Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB8	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB9	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB10	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB11	No consideration given to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure from increased population. More vehicles but there are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Without supporting infrastructure there will be gridlock and Prey Heath Road will become dangerous.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes	No further modification is 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 there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is 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>	
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB8	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB9	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB10	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB11	Wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Smarts Heath and Prey Heath.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB7	Mayford already provides a major contribution toward the Traveller Community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Increased use of the site would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	The allocation of Ten Acres to provide pitches is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
23	Carol	Scrivner	General	Please reconsider your plans which will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village, which is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. I am happy that the Mayford Village Society also represents my views.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 12. The Core Strategy includes specific policies to protect the character of Mayford (Policy CS6). It is accepted that the proposals will introduces change in the general vicinity of Mayford. However, it expected that they will not unacceptably undermine the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB12	Personally told by Councillor Bowes before the election the Conservatives had pledged not to consider Green Belt proposals until after a 2027 review. The statement was misleading as land is going to be released in 2027 for housing.	None stated.	The sites in Pyrford are proposed for safeguarding to meet future development needs post 2027. This is fully explained in Section 1.0 and Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB13	Personally told by Councillor Bowes before the election the Conservatives had pledged not to consider Green Belt proposals until after a 2027 review. The statement was misleading as land is going to be released in 2027 for housing.	None stated.	The sites in Pyrford are proposed for safeguarding to meet future development needs post 2027. This is fully explained in Section 1.0 and Section 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB12	This will not solve the housing shortage but compound the problem going forward. More housing increases the population of an area, creating more demand for	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 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
				development on this area's Green Belt in the future. The proposal should be rejected.			
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB13	This will not solve the housing shortage but compound the problem going forward. More housing increases the population of an area, creating more demand for development on this area's Green Belt in the future. The proposal should be rejected.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB12	The area suffers from water shortages, landfill concerns, pollution and traffic, furthermore local infrastructure is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Council has and is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that provision keeps up with development and future demand. In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on pollution without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB13	The area suffers from water shortages, landfill concerns, pollution and traffic, furthermore local infrastructure is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Council has and is committed to working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that provision keeps up with development and future demand. In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on pollution without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB12	The negative impacts outweigh any positives for development. Areas in the Borough require regeneration and redevelopment and these areas should be developed. The character of a thriving area should not be destroyed.	None stated.	The Council has set out over 50 sites in the Site Allocations DPD within the existing urban area. These sites include redevelopment and comprehensive regeneration schemes. The Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy. These objectives can not be fully met solely through redevelopment in the urban areas. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB13	The negative impacts outweigh any positives for development. Areas in the Borough require regeneration and redevelopment and these areas should be developed. The character of a thriving area should not be destroyed.	None stated.	The Council has set out over 50 sites in the Site Allocations DPD within the existing urban area. These sites include redevelopment and comprehensive regeneration schemes. The Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy. These objectives can not be fully met solely through redevelopment in the urban areas. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB12	The proposal is short sighted and a knee jerk reaction. It will cause harm to the area's character, amenity of adjoining properties and other interest of acknowledged importance.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD seeks to allocate and safeguard development sites in the Borough up until 2040. It is therefore not considered to be a short sighted proposal. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB13	The proposal is short sighted and a knee jerk reaction. It will cause harm to the area's character, amenity of adjoining properties and other interest of acknowledged importance.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD seeks to allocate and safeguard development sites in the Borough up until 2040. It is therefore not considered to be a short sighted proposal. Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB12	Object to the proposal. The area is undeveloped to stop towns spreading into the countryside.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
995	C	Sears - Keale	GB13	Object to the proposal. The area is undeveloped to stop towns spreading into the countryside.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	A major part of the problem is the definition of the purposes of the Green Belt, as a strategic policy tool to restrict development around and between town and cities. Lists the five main purposes of the Green Belt as identified in the NPPF. These specific points are there to support the underlying purpose of the Green Belt, which I see as maintaining the wellbeing of individuals by allowing them to feel part of a discreet community with access to green spaces. The report (the GBR) goes out of its way to show it adheres to the detailed purposes of the Green Belt and ticks the boxes, while ignoring the overarching purpose of the Green Belt. This allows it to conclude that Byfleet would be better off without any green space as it would be benefited by a well defined boundary; the M25/ Wey Navigation.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. In addition, please refer to Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	A major part of the problem is the definition of the purposes of the Green Belt, as a strategic policy tool to restrict development around and between town and cities. Lists the five main purposes of the Green Belt as identified in the NPPF. These specific points are there to support the underlying purpose of the Green Belt, which I see as maintaining the wellbeing of individuals by allowing them to feel part of a discreet community with access to green spaces. The report (the GBR) goes out of its way to show it adheres to the detailed purposes of the Green Belt and ticks the boxes, while ignoring the overarching purpose of the Green Belt. This allows it to conclude that Byfleet would be better off without any green space as it would be benefited by a well defined boundary; the M25/ Wey Navigation.	None stated.	The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development needs (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. In addition, please refer to Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	Byfleet has been heavily developed over the years and there is very little green space left for the population to enjoy. It would be a tragedy if the last of it were taken away, leaving only a little space that is prone to flooding or trapped by the motorway. This is particularly striking when almost all of the rest of Woking's Green Belt (outside Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford) has been left untouched. Is this fringe part of the borough simply seen as a convenient dumping ground for unwanted development?	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	Byfleet has been heavily developed over the years and there is very little green space left for the population to enjoy. It would be a tragedy if the last of it were taken away, leaving only a little space that is prone to flooding or trapped by the motorway. This is particularly striking when almost all of the rest of Woking's Green Belt (outside Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford) has been left untouched. Is this fringe part of the borough simply seen as a convenient dumping ground for unwanted development?	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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	Byfleet has reached capacity, is densely filled and has hardly any green spaces left. There is real upset at the prospect of removing the rest of it. Perhaps there is any argument for a new community in the Borough, with proper underlying infrastructure (as with Goldsworth Park, some years ago). It is unfair to remove most green space from Byfleet, while leaving most of the rest of the borough untouched. It suggests a desire to keep development and associated problems as near to the borough's boundaries as possible.	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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	Byfleet has reached capacity, is densely filled and has hardly any green spaces left. There is real upset at the prospect of removing the rest of it. Perhaps there is any argument for a new community in the Borough, with proper underlying infrastructure (as with Goldsworth Parks, some years ago). It is unfair to remove most green space from Byfleet, while leaving most of the rest of the borough untouched. It suggests a desire to keep development and associated problems as near to the borough's boundaries as possible.	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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	Questions the need to keep filling up the south east of England, and in particular Woking. It is acknowledged that one of the problems with the country is the concentration of economic activity in London and the south east. The focus should be improving the economic health and desirability of the rest of the UK, rather than encouraging population to move to the south east. If development helped future local generations stay in the local area there would be some merit, but in practise they are forced out by price.	None stated.	These points are noted (and as issues to be considered at a national level, unfortunately can not be addressed as part of this DPD). The draft DPD seeks to deliver development to meet objectively assessed need within the Borough, and by providing greater supply of housing should help to alleviate the shortage of housing. This shortage pushes up prices. It is acknowledged that not all of the Borough's need for housing can be met, due to a number of constraints, but the Council, through this document seeks to deliver a target (of 292 units per year until 2026) which will go at least some way toward meeting local need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	Questions the need to keep filling up the south east of England, and in particular Woking. It is acknowledged that one of the problems with the country is the concentration of economic activity in London and the south east. The focus should be improving the economic health and desirability of the rest of the UK, rather than encouraging population to move to the south east. If development helped future local generations stay in the local area there would be some merit, but in practise they are forced out by price.	None stated.	These points are noted (and as issues to be considered at a national level, unfortunately can not be addressed as part of this DPD). The draft DPD seeks to deliver development to meet objectively assessed need within the Borough, and by providing greater supply of housing should help to alleviate the shortage of housing. This shortage pushes up prices. It is acknowledged that not all of the Borough's need for housing can be met, due to a number of constraints, but the Council, through this document seeks to deliver a target (of 292 units per year until 2026) which will go at least some way toward meeting local need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	It is very difficult to accept the concentration of Green Belt release in Byfleet and West Byfleet, alongside almost all of Woking's Green Belt being left untouched.	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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	It is very difficult to accept the concentration of Green Belt release in Byfleet and West Byfleet, alongside almost all of Woking's Green Belt being left untouched.	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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	Surely we are trying to get people outside into the fresh air - and children away from computer/ TV screens and the increasingly obese population out and about? This does not start with removing green spaces that encourages them outside.	None stated.	The provision of open space and green infrastructure to encourage recreation and more active lifestyles is encouraged in the Council's Core Strategy, Policy CS17. Policy CS18 outlines the Council's sustainable transport objectives which can help promote active travel choices. These policies would apply to any proposed development. Also, key requirements for the site note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Also the Council will ensure that there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	Surely we are trying to get people outside into the fresh air - and children away from computer/ TV screens and the increasingly obese population out and about? This does not start with removing green spaces that encourages them outside.	None stated.	The provision of open space and green infrastructure to encourage recreation and more active lifestyles is encouraged in the Council's Core Strategy, Policy CS17. Policy CS18 outlines the Council's sustainable transport objectives which can help promote active travel choices. These policies would apply to any proposed development. Also, key requirements for the site note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Also the Council will ensure that there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	The Byfleet area already has huge problems with infrastructure (traffic, air quality, health provision, schools and flooding) and increasing the population before addressing these issues is surely unthinkable?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 5.0. In terms of health provision, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	The Byfleet area already has huge problems with infrastructure (traffic, air quality, health provision, schools and flooding) and increasing the population before addressing these issues is surely unthinkable?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0 and 5.0. In terms of health provision, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	The Green Belt Review (by a independent consultant renowned for a desire to see the end of the Green Belt) comes to the conclusion that Byfleet would be better off with the removal of its odd little pockets of green space, so we can have a well defined boundary of the M25/ Wey Navigation - a very odd argument that is not shared locally.	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	No further modification is 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 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 addition, further detail on the Green Belt Review and on local impacts of Green Belt release can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 10.0 and 21.0.	
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	The Green Belt Review (by a independent consultant renowned for a desire to see the end of the Green Belt) comes to the conclusion that Byfleet would be better off with the removal of its odd little pockets of green space, so we can have a well defined boundary of the M25/ Wey Navigation - a very odd argument that is not shared locally.	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 addition, further detail on the Green Belt Review and on local impacts of Green Belt release can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 10.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	The DPD wishes to demonstrate the need for Green Belt release and relies heavily on a 'independent review' for Green Belt release. The study's focus is finding Green Belt sites for release and identifies parcels of land which are 'preferred' for further investigations for removal from the Green Belt. There is strong feeling that the Council has selected an 'independent' reviewer with a published dislike of the Green Belt, and therefore has spent money independently confirming what they wish to do.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 8.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	The DPD wishes to demonstrate the need for Green Belt release and relies heavily on a 'independent review' for Green Belt release. The study's focus is finding Green Belt sites for release and identifies parcels of land which are 'preferred' for further investigations for removal from the Green Belt. There is strong feeling that the Council has selected an 'independent' reviewer with a published dislike of the Green Belt, and therefore has spent money independently confirming what they wish to do.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 8.0, 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	UA1	There have been many suggestions for this site over the years, all to make greater use of the space available. Detailed proposals will be looked at with interest. There is strong feeling in the community that the facilities currently offered by the library and the Heritage Room should not be lost.	None stated.	The Key Requirements of the draft allocation states that any proposal will need to include a replacement community facility (library). A library will therefore be reprovided as part of any development of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	Asks whether there is a real need to build so many homes in the borough. It has grown enormously recently, and has perhaps reached capacity. If we are trying to break the onward drive of people to the south east we should be making other parts of the country more attractive. Whilst concerned about the ability of future generations to live where they have grown up, building more homes locally won't help ease the problem.	None stated.	The need for housing is assessed in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (or SHMA), 2009 and 2015, available on the Council's website. The SHMA 2009, alongside a number of other evidence base documents, informs the Council's development requirements, set in the Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and detailed further with regard to the draft Site Allocations DPD in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	Asks whether there is a real need to build so many homes in the borough. It has grown enormously recently, and has perhaps reached capacity. If we are trying to break the onward drive of people to the south east we should be making other parts of the country more attractive. Whilst concerned about the ability of future generations to live where they have grown up, building more homes locally won't help ease the problem.	None stated.	The need for housing is assessed in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (or SHMA), 2009 and 2015, available on the Council's website. The SHMA 2009, alongside a number of other evidence base documents, informs the Council's development requirements, set in the Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and detailed further with regard to the draft Site Allocations DPD in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 8.0.	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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB4	There are already huge problems in Byfleet which are not being addressed and will be exacerbated by developing more houses on green field. These issues include flooding (problems arise regularly); traffic particularly when there are problems on the M25 or A3, and associated poor air quality; health facilities and the fact people have to go to West Byfleet for these, adding to congestion on the A245, as there are no local facilities; and schools, which are oversubscribed and due to the lack of places have had to use temporary classrooms.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of infrastructure, flooding and traffic in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 5.0 and 24.0. In terms of health provision, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1486	Jeff	Sechiari	GB5	There are already huge problems in Byfleet which are not being addressed and will be exacerbated by developing more houses on green field. These issues include flooding (problems arise regularly); traffic particularly when there are problems on the M25 or A3, and associated poor air quality; health facilities and the fact people have to go to West Byfleet for these, adding to congestion on the A245, as there are no local facilities; and schools, which are oversubscribed and due to the lack of places have had to use temporary classrooms.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in terms of infrastructure, flooding and traffic in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 5.0 and 24.0. In terms of health provision, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB7	Object to proposal. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution toward 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1647	C	Seldenrath	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 toward 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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 toward 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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</p>	No further modification is 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 toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1647	C	Seldenrath	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 toward 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development			
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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 field 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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB8	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB9	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	GB7	Traveller sites should have access to local facilities. The site is not near a school or easy access to local services. There are virtually no local facilities in Mayford.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
1647	C	Seldenrath	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB7	Other potential sites - the GBR included as options to meet future need for pitches WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet (4 pitches) and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green (3 pitches). There are also sites adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with capacity to deliver 15 pitches and a mixed and balanced community, land west of West Hall, West Byfleet WGB004a (SHLAABW019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation other than "it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt", as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB7	Additional Health and Safety considerations - Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy and be sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration is to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site. There is greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to ensure that sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment and to the amenity of residents.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				than in conventional housing and need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate impact on quality of life and health. Public use of Smarts Heath Common means no visual privacy on the site. The proximity of the main railway line means is unlikely acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise of trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the local approved 'lorry' route. There is no footpath on one side so children would have to cross the road to reach one.			
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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.	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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 Lancap Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancap setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB7	Additional pitches and related activities may present an increased risk to flooding as development may give rise to	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,	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
				hard landscaping, bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river.		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.	of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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 toward 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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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	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
				pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.		<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>	
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5</p>	No further modification is 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 flood risk to surrounding properties.			of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB7	SITE SELECTION - A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban	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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						19.0 and Section 23.0	
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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. See Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB10	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development 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>	
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB9	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p>	No further modification is 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 proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.	
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB10	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
316	Agnieszka	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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.	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
317	Federico	Selmi	GB7	4.Environmentally sensitive Sites - proposals that will adversely impact environmentally sensitive sites and cannot	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	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
				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.		environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	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 lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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 toward 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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0 In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB9	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0 In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				exclude development.		<p>proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB8	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	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, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	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, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	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, particularly paragraph 5.4 and 5.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	GB7	No independently verified evidence produced to demonstrate the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller site development or why sites identified in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres) are the	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 16.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				ONLY sites put forward.			
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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 Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights 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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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	No further modification is 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>	
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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.	<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
317	Federico	Selmi	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.	<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
317	Federico	Selmi	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. See Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0</p>	
317	Federico	Selmi	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. See Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB11	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
317	Federico	Selmi	GB8	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over half an hour. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>It is noted that at times the maintenance of roads and the railway will require roads to closed or restricted to carry out these important works. The Council acknowledges that this can have short term impacts on congestion and accessibility through the local area. Although the Council sympathise with these concerns the maintenance of roads and other infrastructure is essential.</p> <p>Any proposed improvements or changes to the existing road network will be subject to drainage assessments to make sure that the roads have the capacity to drain away rain water and are fit for purpose.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
317	Federico	Selmi	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
192	Graham	Service	GB10	Proposed density of development is inconsistent with the density of the surrounding area.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB11	Proposed density of development is inconsistent with the density of the surrounding area.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB14	Proposed density of development is inconsistent with the density of the surrounding area.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB8	Proposed density of development is inconsistent with the density of the surrounding area.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB9	Proposed density of development is inconsistent with the density of the surrounding area.	None stated.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB11	There is inadequate infrastructure to support development. At peak times roads are near gridlock and alternative routes along Saunders Lane or Hook Hill Lane are inadequate to carry additional traffic.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any planning application and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the sites are sustainable. The representation about lack of buses in the area is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand that will result from the development on the back of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand. Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses how the transport implications of the proposals are assessed and/or will be addressed. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the development in the area will require traffic mitigation measures, this can be addressed as part of the planning application process. The key requirements of the proposals requests for detailed transport assessment to be carried out to inform any planning application for the development of the site. The Council will work with the County Council to make sure that this is carried to the required standards and any adverse impacts mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB10	There is inadequate infrastructure to support development. At peak times roads are near gridlock and alternative routes along Saunders Lane or Hook Hill Lane are inadequate to carry additional traffic.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living 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.</p>	
192	Graham	Service	GB8	There is inadequate infrastructure to support development. At peak times roads are near gridlock and alternative routes along Saunders Lane or Hook Hill Lane are inadequate to carry additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB9	There is inadequate infrastructure to support development. At peak times roads are near gridlock and alternative routes along Saunders Lane or Hook Hill Lane are inadequate to carry additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB14	There is inadequate infrastructure to support development. At peak times roads are near gridlock and alternative routes along Saunders Lane or Hook Hill Lane are inadequate to carry additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in</p>	No further modification is 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 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	
192	Graham	Service	GB8	There is no need for all of these areas to be removed from the Green Belt to meet a hypothetical need for housing from 2027, for which there is no evidence. We vehemently object to these proposals.	None stated.	The justification for safeguarding land to meet development needs from 2027 to 2040 is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB9	There is no need for all of these areas to be removed from the Green Belt to meet a hypothetical need for housing from 2027, for which there is no evidence. We vehemently object to these proposals.	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
192	Graham	Service	GB10	There is no need for all of these areas to be removed from the Green Belt to meet a hypothetical need for housing from 2027, for which there is no evidence. We vehemently object to these proposals.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB11	There is no need for all of these areas to be removed from the Green Belt to meet a hypothetical need for housing from 2027, for which there is no evidence. We vehemently object to these proposals.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council's justification for safeguarding land to meet development needs between 2027 and 2040 is particularly set out in Section 2 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB14	There is no need for all of these areas to be removed from the Green Belt to meet a hypothetical need for housing from 2027, for which there is no evidence. We vehemently object to these proposals.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB8	With regard to proposals to remove areas from the Green Belt, particularly GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, withdrawal of land from the Green Belt should only be considered in exceptional circumstances. We do not believe these exist. Green Belt is to provide green areas between developed areas; building on these will create unmitigated urban sprawl, one dire concreted jungle.	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
192	Graham	Service	GB9	With regard to proposals to remove areas from the Green Belt, particularly GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, withdrawal of land from the Green Belt should only be considered in exceptional circumstances. We do not believe these exist. Green Belt is to provide green areas between developed areas; building on these will create unmitigated urban sprawl, one dire concreted jungle.	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
192	Graham	Service	GB10	With regard to proposals to remove areas from the Green Belt, particularly GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14,	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				withdrawal of land from the Green Belt should only be considered in exceptional circumstances. We do not believe these exist. Green Belt is to provide green areas between developed areas; building on these will create unmitigated urban sprawl, one dire concreted jungle.		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.	
192	Graham	Service	GB11	With regard to proposals to remove areas from the Green Belt, particularly GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, withdrawal of land from the Green Belt should only be considered in exceptional circumstances. We do not believe these exist. Green Belt is to provide green areas between developed areas; building on these will create unmitigated urban sprawl, one dire concreted jungle.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
192	Graham	Service	GB14	With regard to proposals to remove areas from the Green Belt, particularly GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14, withdrawal of land from the Green Belt should only be considered in exceptional circumstances. We do not believe these exist. Green Belt is to provide green areas between developed areas; building on these will create unmitigated urban sprawl, one dire concreted jungle.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous to pedestrians due to increased traffic (there are no pavements). Egley Road and the Mayford roundabout lack crossings. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or railway bridges.	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. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous to pedestrians due to increased traffic (there are no pavements). Egley Road and the Mayford roundabout lack crossings. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or railway bridges.	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. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but	No further modification is 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>marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	<p>Prey Heath Road will become dangerous to pedestrians due to increased traffic (there are no pavements). Egley Road and the Mayford roundabout lack crossings. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or railway bridges.</p>	None stated.	<p>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. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	<p>Prey Heath Road will become dangerous to pedestrians due to increased traffic (there are no pavements). Egley Road and the Mayford roundabout lack crossings. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or railway bridges.</p>	None stated.	<p>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. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway</p>	No further modification is 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. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous to pedestrians due to increased traffic (there are no pavements). Egley Road and the Mayford roundabout lack crossings. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or railway bridges.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	Better for the environment and Mayford residents to protect the Green Belt with its natural grassland, shrubs, trees and woodland. Concrete does not absorb rainwater or CO2. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. Flood risk issues are covered in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	Better for the environment and Mayford residents to protect the Green Belt with its natural grassland, shrubs, trees and woodland. Concrete does not absorb rainwater or CO2. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	Better for the environment and Mayford residents to protect the Green Belt with its natural grassland, shrubs, trees and woodland. Concrete does not absorb rainwater or CO2. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The 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 addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	Better for the environment and Mayford residents to protect the Green Belt with its natural grassland, shrubs, trees and woodland. Concrete does not absorb rainwater or CO2. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	Better for the environment and Mayford residents to protect the Green Belt with its natural grassland, shrubs, trees and woodland. Concrete does not absorb rainwater or CO2. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This matter is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The flood risk issues associated with the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issuers and Matters Topic Paper.	
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB7	I strongly object to GB7. Mayford already has a number of unofficial and official pitches. IT is not appropriate to bring further members of the Traveller community in at the expense of Green Belt.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB7	Better to look at more urban locations which satisfy the criteria of good access to jobs, shops, other infrastructure and services.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and should not be considered for development. It will have a devastating impact on this historic village's identity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and should not be considered for development. It will have a devastating impact on this historic village's identity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and should not be considered for development. It will have a devastating impact on this historic village's identity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and should not be considered for development. It will have a devastating impact on this historic village's identity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of lancap as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the lancap implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (Policy CS24). The development planned will have a devastating impact on this historic Village and preservation of its identity.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	Mayford residents will lose healthy open green spaces to walk or exercise dogs, wildlife will be wiped out and wildlife corridors will be destroyed. This will reduce quality of life and health of the surrounding population, conflicting with public health strategies.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites. It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the well being of the community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	Mayford residents will lose healthy open green spaces to walk or exercise dogs, wildlife will be wiped out and wildlife corridors will be destroyed. This will reduce quality of life and health of the surrounding population, conflicting with public health strategies.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	Mayford residents will lose healthy open green spaces to walk or exercise dogs, wildlife will be wiped out and wildlife corridors will be destroyed. This will reduce quality of life and health of the surrounding population, conflicting with public health strategies.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	Mayford residents will lose healthy open green spaces to walk or exercise dogs, wildlife will be wiped out and wildlife corridors will be destroyed. This will reduce quality of life and health of the surrounding population, conflicting with public health strategies.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	Mayford residents will lose healthy open green spaces to walk or exercise dogs, wildlife will be wiped out and wildlife corridors will be destroyed. This will reduce quality of life and health of the surrounding population, conflicting with public health strategies.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. I do not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced.	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
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. I do not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced.	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
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. I do not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. I do not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	I strongly object to the proposal for housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14. I do not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced.	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
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB7	Smarts Heath Common is an SSSI used for leisure. Ten Acre Farm is adjacent, an increase in the present Traveller site would decrease visual amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site and the adjacent SSSI. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						is sustainable	
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	Local infrastructure is unable to cope with the volume of existing demand. Roads are narrow, many without pavements and unlit. Developments already underway or recently completed will further increase demand. Road maintenance is poor, extra traffic will do further damage.	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
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	Local infrastructure is unable to cope with the volume of existing demand. Roads are narrow, many without pavements and unlit. Developments already underway or recently completed will further increase demand. Road maintenance is poor, extra traffic will do further damage.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	Local infrastructure is unable to cope with the volume of existing demand. Roads are narrow, many without pavements and unlit. Developments already underway or recently completed will further increase demand. Road maintenance is poor, extra traffic will do further damage.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	Local infrastructure is unable to cope with the volume of existing demand. Roads are narrow, many without pavements and unlit. Developments already underway or recently completed will further increase demand. Road maintenance is poor, extra traffic will do further damage.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	Local infrastructure is unable to cope with the volume of existing demand. Roads are narrow, many without pavements and unlit. Developments already underway or recently completed will further increase demand. Road maintenance is poor, extra traffic will do further damage.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	Significant risk of losing Mayford's village identity, to become a suburb of Woking and/or Guildford. Infrastructure services will be unable to cope with the additional demand. I understand that some facilities will be included in the development plans, but less than demand because the developers want to maximise land for housing and minimise that for amenity provision.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out an assessment of the sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes the preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will be compromised. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, the proposals include key requirements to ensure the any development that comes forward meets very high standards before they can be acceptable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	Significant risk of losing Mayford's village identity, to become a suburb of Woking and/or Guildford. Infrastructure services will be unable to cope with the additional demand. I understand that some facilities will be included in the development plans, but less than demand because the developers want to maximise land for housing and minimise that for amenity provision.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes the preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will be compromised. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, the proposals include key requirements to ensure the any development that comes forward meets very high standards before they can be acceptable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	Significant risk of losing Mayford's village identity, to become a suburb of Woking and/or Guildford. Infrastructure services will be unable to cope with the additional demand. I understand that some facilities will be included in the development plans, but less than demand because the developers want to maximise land for housing and minimise that for amenity provision.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes the preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will be compromised. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, the proposals include key requirements to ensure the any development that comes forward meets very high standards before they can be acceptable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	Significant risk of losing Mayford's village identity, to become a suburb of Woking and/or Guildford. Infrastructure services will be unable to cope with the additional demand. I understand that some facilities will be included in the development plans, but less than demand because the developers want to maximise land for housing and minimise that for amenity provision.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes the preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will be compromised. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, the proposals include key requirements to ensure the any development that comes forward meets very high standards before they can be acceptable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	Significant risk of losing Mayford's village identity, to become a suburb of Woking and/or Guildford. Infrastructure services will be unable to cope with the additional demand. I understand that some facilities will be included in the development plans, but less than demand because the developers want to maximise land for housing and minimise that for amenity provision.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the sites against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes the preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford and/or Woking will be compromised. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, the proposals include key requirements to ensure the any development that comes forward meets very high standards before they can be acceptable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB11	Whatever the financial benefits to the Council (via New Homes Bonus, council tax, Community Infrastructure Levy etc.) there will be insufficient investment in the area's amenity and services to mitigate the additional demands development would create. Politicians should represent residents' views and direct public servants accordingly. There are undeveloped derelict brownfield sites that additional homes could be built on, spreading the load on infrastructure. These small developments are unattractive to developers but should be used first. Please also see the response by Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land in the urban area to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. The Council has a responsibility to make provision to meet the development needs of the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB10	Whatever the financial benefits to the Council (via New Homes Bonus, council tax, Community Infrastructure Levy etc.) there will be insufficient investment in the area's amenity and services to mitigate the additional demands development would create. Politicians should represent residents' views and direct public servants accordingly. There are undeveloped derelict brownfield sites that additional homes could be built on, spreading the load on infrastructure. These small developments are unattractive to developers but should be used first. Please also see the response by Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an extensive assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 11. 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
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB14	Whatever the financial benefits to the Council (via New	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	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
				Homes Bonus, council tax, Community Infrastructure Levy etc.) there will be insufficient investment in the area's amenity and services to mitigate the additional demands development would create. Politicians should represent residents' views and direct public servants accordingly. There are undeveloped derelict brownfield sites that additional homes could be built on, spreading the load on infrastructure. These small developments are unattractive to developers but should be used first. Please also see the response by Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.		<p>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. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.</p>	of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB8	Whatever the financial benefits to the Council (via New Homes Bonus, council tax, Community Infrastructure Levy etc.) there will be insufficient investment in the area's amenity and services to mitigate the additional demands development would create. Politicians should represent residents' views and direct public servants accordingly. There are undeveloped derelict brownfield sites that additional homes could be built on, spreading the load on infrastructure. These small developments are unattractive to developers but should be used first. Please also see the response by Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.	None stated.	The proposals are necessary to meet development needs of the area. Infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The Council has a responsibility to meet the objectively assessed needs of the community, and the proposals will contribute to meeting this objective. The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the identified need. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet the needs over the entire plan period. This matter has comprehensively been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 11 and 9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1184	Jonathan	Sewell	GB9	Whatever the financial benefits to the Council (via New Homes Bonus, council tax, Community Infrastructure Levy etc.) there will be insufficient investment in the area's amenity and services to mitigate the additional demands development would create. Politicians should represent residents' views and direct public servants accordingly. There are undeveloped derelict brownfield sites that additional homes could be built on, spreading the load on infrastructure. These small developments are unattractive to developers but should be used first. Please also see the response by Mayford Village Society who I am happy to represent my views.	None stated.	The proposals are necessary to meet development needs of the area. Infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The Council has a responsibility to meet the objectively assessed needs of the community, and the proposals will contribute to meeting this objective. The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the identified need. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet the needs over the entire plan period. This matter has comprehensively been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 11 and 9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	A planning application has been submitted to the council for internal and external alterations to the building to make it more attractive to potential retail and office occupiers. This will result in significant investment in the building and	None stated.	Comments noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				strengthen the vitality and viability of the town centre in accordance with the Core Strategy. Planning officers are supportive of the proposals			
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	The policy outlines that the existing canopy that abuts the building may limit design of any scheme for redevelopment. The policy should allow for removal of the canopy if appropriate justification is provided, to ensure the building's design and appearance, and potential for public realm improvements, is not inhibited by the canopy.	The policy should allow for removal of the canopy if appropriate justification is provided, to ensure the building's design and appearance, and potential for public realm improvements and enhancements to the arrival experience into the town centre, are not inhibited.	The Council believes that there can be a design solution to the development of the area that integrates the canopy. It will be for any applicant to demonstrate why the removal of the canopy and the benefits it brings should not be retained. The suggested modification is therefore unnecessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	It may not be appropriate for development to deliver some of the key requirements set out by Policy UA6, including financial contributions and residential as part of mixed use development. This should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The policy should be more flexible and be responsive to market demand, and allow development that supports economic growth in the town centre. This will also ensure that current proposals being progressed, which will result in significant office and retail investment, will not be undermined.	Amend to be more flexible and responsive to market demand, and allow development that supports economic growth in the town centre.	It is important that the allocation of site sits within the overall spatial strategy for the area. That includes the appropriateness of certain types of uses at certain location. The proposed allocation is appropriate for the site. The merits of any particular individual proposal will be considered on its merits taken into account the contribution the proposal will make to the economic, social and environmental characteristics of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	While the uses allocated on the site (residential, office and retail uses) are supported in principle, we consider the site should also explicitly support proposals that seek to enhance the existing building. This will establish a flexible policy context able to respond to market demand, and ensure proposals being progressed by Wrenbridge are not potentially undermined.	None stated.	Depending on the nature of the enhancement being suggested, it might not require the site to be allocated to achieve that. The site has redevelopment potential to maximise its status as a gateway site, and the proposal allocation will help achieve that. The proposal will not undermine any potential enhancement to the building. There are sufficient policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to deal with any such applications that might come forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	The criteria of the policy on A1 retail use on the secondary frontage is overly prescriptive, and should be revised to reflect the more positive Core Strategy (Policy CS2) wording, which is more favourable toward other A Class uses within secondary frontages, if they would not have significant harmful effects on the frontage, crime and disorder and the vitality and viability of the town centre.	Replace existing criteria on changes to A1 retail use with wording that reflects the Core Strategy (Policy CS2): 'The Council will consider favourably change of use proposals to other A Class uses within	It is important that the allocation of site sits within the overall spatial strategy for the area. That includes the appropriateness of certain types of uses at certain location. The proposed allocation is appropriate for the site. The merits of any particular individual proposal will be considered on its merits taken into account the contribution the proposal will make to the economic, social and environmental characteristics 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
					secondary frontages if it can be determined they would not have significant harmful effects on the frontage, crime and disorder and the vitality and viability of the town centre.'		
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	Outlines Policy UA6's affordable housing requirement. The policy should state the requirement to deliver affordable housing and other financial contributions will be subject to a financial viability assessment to ensure development is not constrained in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS12. Important due to the policy's other requirements that may impact on viability, including delivery of exceptional design quality, and exploring potential CHP network options.	Amend to state that affordable housing and other financial contribution requirements are subject to a financial viability assessment in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS12.	It is important that the development of any site meets the policy requirements of the development plan for the area. In particular, it is important that development is supported by necessary infrastructure to be sustainable. Both policies CS12 (Affordable Housing) and CS22 (Sustainable Construction) allow flexibility for the applicant to make a case based on viability evidence if it is felt that the viability of a proposal is threatened. The suggested modification to the proposal is therefore unnecessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	Represents Wrenbridge, the owner of the site since Dec 2014, who are in the process of exploring various development options to modify and enhance the existing building. Wrenbridge are committed to improving the quality of the building to support economic growth in the town centre.	None stated.	Noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	Wrenbridge are currently discussing development options with planning officers to significantly enhance the existing building's office and retail provision. The policy should therefore explicitly support development that improves the quality of the existing building.	The policy should explicitly support development that improves the quality of the existing building.	Depending on the nature of the enhancement being suggested, it might not require the site to be allocated to achieve that. The site has redevelopment potential to maximise its status as a gateway site, and the proposal allocation will help achieve that. The proposal will not undermine any potential enhancement to the building. There are sufficient policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to deal with any such applications that might come forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
505	Emily	Seymour	UA6	Welcomes the inclusion of this site for potential mixed use development, and recognition of it occupying a key entrance point to the town centre. However, feels for the reasons set out that Policy UA6 is too onerous and could inhibit future development on the site.	None stated.	Because of the gateway location of the site, development of the site will require careful and high quality design to enhance the character of the area. The key requirements of the proposal are necessary to enable this objective to be achieved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
921	V	Seymour	GB4	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt.	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
921	V	Seymour	GB5	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt.	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
921	V	Seymour	GB12	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt.	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
921	V	Seymour	GB13	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt.	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
921	V	Seymour	GB15	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt.	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
921	V	Seymour	GB16	Object to development proposals on the Greenbelt.	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
467	Keith	Shackell	General	Familiar with NIMBY sneers levelled at objectors to public sector projects. However, the concept of Green Belt was developed to protect British Heritage in the face of rampant and creeping concretisation	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
467	Keith	Shackell	General	Strongly objects to the release of Green Belt land for housing or any other development purpose.	None stated.	This is a false representation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
467	Keith	Shackell	General	Does not want to see valuable countryside developed when there are any brownfield sites in the country still available.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
467	Keith	Shackell	General	Asks the question 'how big do you want to see Woking? Should it grow further? There is a saying 'If I build it they will come'. No doubt they will, which will involve a further need for more concrete and continuing urbanisation, forever. Strongly objects to the planned development [in the Green Belt].	None stated.	This is an interesting question and representation. The growth and development targets for the Borough, for the period to 2026, are set in the Council's Core Strategy, adopted in 2012. This document seeks to deliver these development requirements, in part to meet housing need. This is further outlined in the Introduction of the draft Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
485	Richard	Sharp	GB12	Objects to the plans as Pyrford is fast becoming overcrowded in terms of people, housing and traffic. There has been a dramatic increase in housing, particularly its density as people have built in gardens, schools etc.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, with paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11 on traffic, and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
485	Richard	Sharp	GB13	Objects to the plans as Pyrford is fast becoming overcrowded in terms of people, housing and traffic. There has been a dramatic increase in housing, particularly its density as people have built in gardens, schools etc.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, with paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11 on traffic, and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
485	Richard	Sharp	GB2	Strongly objects to plans to provide additional sites for travellers in surrounding areas, due to abusive and aggressive behaviour, thieving and rubbish left behind by travellers.	None stated.	Objection noted. The anti-social behaviour referred to it outside the remit of planning, which has a duty to meet identified need for traveller pitches through the identification of land (see Section 4.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Paper). However, the Council and County Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of traveller sites, and to attempt to tackle any issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
485	Richard	Sharp	GB3	Strongly objects to plans to provide additional sites for travellers in surrounding areas, due to abusive and aggressive behaviour, thieving and rubbish left behind by travellers.	None stated.	Objection noted. The anti-social behaviour referred to it outside the remit of planning, which has a duty to meet identified need for traveller pitches through the identification of land (see Section 4.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Paper). However, the Council and County Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of traveller sites, and to attempt to tackle any issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
485	Richard	Sharp	GB7	Strongly objects to plans to provide additional sites for travellers in surrounding areas, due to abusive and aggressive behaviour, thieving and rubbish left behind by travellers.	None stated.	Objection noted. The anti-social behaviour referred to it outside the remit of planning, which has a duty to meet identified need for traveller pitches through the identification of land (see Section 4.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Paper). However, the Council and County Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of traveller sites, and to attempt to tackle any issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
485	Richard	Sharp	GB12	This development has added traffic, particularly at rush hour, making it unpleasant and further confused by groups of cyclists on the Olympic cycle route.	None stated.	This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that cycling is encouraged by the Council, as a sustainable mode of transport and is not considered in itself to create a hazard. On the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that in any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
485	Richard	Sharp	GB13	This development has added traffic, particularly at rush hour, making it unpleasant and further confused by groups of cyclists on the Olympic cycle route.	None stated.	This point is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 3.0, paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. It should be noted that cycling is encouraged by the Council, as a sustainable mode of transport and is not considered in itself to create a hazard. On the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that in any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1246	Robert	Shatwell	General	Object to development in the GB, full use of brownfield sites should be considered in the first instance.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0, and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
							of this representation
1246	Robert	Shatwell	General	The number of proposed developments on GB land is unsustainable consider improving the existing housing stock. No consideration has been given to existing residents.	Scrap the whole lot and reconsider with more thought on improving the current stock of housing.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 9.0, Section 11.0, and Section 16.0 It is important to note that the housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock that is currently occupied, and therefore making more efficient use of existing housing stock will not diminish amount of land needed to meet the overall housing need within the borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1246	Robert	Shatwell	General	Does not consider the EU should have any say in what happens in Britain. The EU are not concerned about sustainability. Scrap and reconsider plans.	Scrap the lot and reconsider more carefully	As part of the European Union, we must comply with relevant obligations set by the EU.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1246	Robert	Shatwell	General	It appears that the main reason for designating the sites is down to EU influence. Believes that the consideration of releasing site from the GB should be held off until the end of 2017 when a referendum on our membership in the EU will be held. If we leave the EU then there is no need for extensive developments	Consideration of releasing GB site for development should be taken at the end of 2017 when a referendum on our membership in the EU will be held.	There is no direct link between preparing the Site Allocation DPD and being a member of the EU. The Council will still be required to deliver the growth set out in the adopted Core Strategy. In fact, most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated and the need will not diminish significantly regardless of whether the country stays in the EU or not.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
371	Antony	Shaw	GB12	Disgusted with plans to build on two fiel in Pyrford. The views over the North Downs area are priceless and the reason why people choose to live in the area. AONB should not be built upon.	None stated.	Whilst this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 and 7.0 It is important to highlight that this area does not fall within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty AONB, nor does any part of Woking generally.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
371	Antony	Shaw	GB13	Disgusted with plans to build on two fiel in Pyrford. The views over the North Downs area are priceless and the reason why people choose to live in the area. AONB should not be built upon.	None stated.	Whilst this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 and 7.0. It is important to highlight that this area does not fall within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty AONB, nor does any part of Woking generally.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
371	Antony	Shaw	GB12	The Council should consider alternative sites for development away from the GB	None stated.	This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
371	Antony	Shaw	GB13	The Council should consider alternative sites for development away from the GB	None stated.	This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
371	Antony	Shaw	GB12	The area is used regularly for recreational purposes	None stated.	This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
371	Antony	Shaw	GB13	The area is used regularly for recreational purposes	None stated.	This has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB12	Additional traffic will cause problems at busy times on these artery roads. There seems no overall planning concept for traffic from this with other increases from development elsewhere (Ockham/Wisley airfield, Send village). The results will be disproportionately harmful.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
208	G	Sheat	GB13	Additional traffic will cause problems at busy times on these artery roads. There seems no overall planning concept for traffic from this with other increases from development elsewhere (Ockham/Wisley airfield, Send village). The results will be disproportionately harmful.	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. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with its neighbouring authorities to make sure that development in their area with cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any potential adverse impacts. This will include development on the Wisley Airfield.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB12	These sites are valuable for walking (well-used footpaths adjoining) and great views to the Surrey Hills. Unclear what 'softening' effect the developments green amenity land would provide. Presently unspoilt countryside. Just one field (to the west) properly screened would be less harmful. The east field opens up the area to building later across the field.	None stated.	The comments are welcome. The Council will make sure that the proposals will include adequate screening and green infrastructure in order not to detract from the visual amenity of residents. The proposals are needed to make a contribution toward meeting future development needs of the area. Based on the evidence the sites are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB13	These sites are valuable for walking (well-used footpaths adjoining) and great views to the Surrey Hills. Unclear what 'softening' effect the developments green amenity land would provide. Presently unspoilt countryside. Just one field (to the west) properly screened would be less harmful. The east field opens up the area to building later across the field.	None stated.	The comments are welcome. The Council will make sure that the proposals will include adequate screening and green infrastructure in order not to detract from the visual amenity of residents. The proposals are needed to make a contribution toward meeting future development needs of the area. Based on the evidence the sites are the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB12	Unclear but probable adverse effect on schooling, public transport, health care and support services.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
208	G	Sheat	GB13	Unclear but probable adverse effect on schooling, public transport, health care and support services.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB12	Should prioritise use of spare land, brown field and redundant commercial sites, lower value green (not Green Belt) land over whole of Woking, not weight it against Pyrford, West Byfleet Green Belt fiel which are greatly valued.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. This is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs of the area over the entire plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB13	Should prioritise use of spare land, brown field and redundant commercial sites, lower value green (not Green Belt) land over whole of Woking, not weight it against Pyrford, West Byfleet Green Belt fiel which are greatly valued.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB12	I object to this building. Pyrford has had considerable new building in proportion rather than that allowed for other parishes (e.g. Pyrford Woo estate took an amount of common woodland). Remaining Green Belt land is essential, especially abutting busy roads like Upshot Lane and Pyrford Road.	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 the most sustainable when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. This is covered in detail in Section 9 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
208	G	Sheat	GB13	I object to this building. Pyrford has had considerable new building in proportion rather than that allowed for other parishes (e.g. Pyrford Woo estate took an amount of common woodland). Remaining Green Belt land is essential, especially abutting busy roads like Upshot Lane and Pyrford Road.	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 proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when considered against all other representations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI which is used for leisure purposes. Development would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase the risk to wildlife by having more domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
1672	Amber	Sheel	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 toward 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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" and therefore should	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap importance has been ignored.		The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Lancap Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of lancap 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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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 toward 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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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</p>	No further modification is 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 toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1672	Amber	Sheel	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 toward 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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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 toward 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).	
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	General	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	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.	The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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 school and associated leisure facilities. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB8	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB9	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB10	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB11	The proposals will have an unjustifiable impact on Mayford residents, all of whom chose to live in a semi-rural and not urban environment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB8	The hours of operation will have a major impact on residents and surrounding local area. It is inappropriate and shows a clear lack of transparency on behalf of the Council.	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. The Council's decision on the proposed school and leisure centre are clearly set out on the Council's website. The Local Planning Authority has attached a number of planning conditions to the permitted scheme in order to minimise the impact of the proposal on the local area. The Council's reasons and decisions are set out within the Officer's Report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB8	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB9	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB10	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The identity and character of Mayford will therefore not be undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB11	The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						will 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.	
1672	Amber	Sheel	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 field 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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	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	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				lane 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>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>	
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						traffic 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.	
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	GB10	WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1672	Amber	Sheel	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
1160	Robin	Shepherd	DNSITE	The site does addresses the purposes of the Green Belt (para. 80 NPPF) as follows. It is surrounded to the east and west by existing residential development and would not extend built form, rather would sympathetically round off existing development. The development would not merge Weybridge with Byfleet. Its development would have no impact on open countryside. The Core Strategy has established there is a need for the release of greenfield sites; thigs site would assist in meeting housing needs with no detriment to the Green Belt.	Land to the east of Sopwith Land should be included within the Site Allocations DPD for residential development of between 20 - 30 dwellings.	The Council has carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of reasonable alternative sites, the Green Belt boundary review and other evidence base studies to inform the DPD. The combined evidence does not support the release of the site from the Green Belt to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1160	Robin	Shepherd	DNSITE	We would like to suggest a new site for consideration: Land to the East of Sopwith Drive. This was submitted to the Council during the 2013 Call for Sites but was not considered suitable predominantly due to its location within Flood Zone 3. The attached Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that development can meet the tests set out in the NPPF and is appropriate for development. The site has been raised out of the flood zone through the land being regarded with soil deposits. It should no longer be automatically excluded from consideration. The site is both suitable and appropriate for residential development as set out within the enclosed report (submitted to the Council in 2013).	Land to the east of Sopwith Land should be included within the Site Allocations DPD for residential development of between 20 - 30 dwellings.	The site has been assessed by the Council. Measured against other reasonable alternatives, the Council does not think that the site should be allocated for residential development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB8	Proposals will put pressure on the highway network, which are currently rural lanes, too narrow and unsuitable for the proposed increase.	Proposals for Mayford should be refused	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6 and Section 24.0. 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. These are set out as 'key requirements' 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB9	Proposals will put pressure on the highway network, which are currently rural lanes, too narrow and unsuitable for the proposed increase.	Proposals for Mayford should be refused	<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 and Section 24.0.</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. These are set out as 'key requirements'</p> <p>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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB10	Proposals will put pressure on the highway network, which are currently rural lanes, too narrow and unsuitable for the proposed increase.	Proposals for Mayford should be refused	<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 and Section 24.0.</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. These are set out as 'key requirements'</p> <p>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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB11	Proposals will put pressure on the highway network, which are currently rural lanes, too narrow and unsuitable for the proposed increase.	Proposals for Mayford should be refused	<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 and Section 24.0.</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. These are set out as 'key requirements'</p> <p>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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB7	The land between Woking and Guildford is precious. It plays a valuable function of keeping the two towns separate, allowing them to maintain their individual identity. Development in this area would be destructive to the special 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB8	The land between Woking and Guildford is precious. It plays a valuable function of keeping the two towns separate, allowing them to maintain their individual identity.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Development in this area would be destructive to the special 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.	
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB9	The land between Woking and Guildford is precious. It plays a valuable function of keeping the two towns separate, allowing them to maintain their individual identity. Development in this area would be destructive to the special 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB10	The land between Woking and Guildford is precious. It plays a valuable function of keeping the two towns separate, allowing them to maintain their individual identity. Development in this area would be destructive to the special 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB11	The land between Woking and Guildford is precious. It plays a valuable function of keeping the two towns separate, allowing them to maintain their individual identity. Development in this area would be destructive to the special 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB7	Object to the increase of Traveller pitches on the site. Mayford already makes a significant contribution to the traveller community. Intensification of use on GB7 would have a negative impact to the adjoining SSSI	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3 and Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB8	The proposals for Mayford would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford. The area has already been damaged by Havering Farm and the growth of market gardens/garden market.	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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB9	The proposals for Mayford would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford. The area has already been damaged by Havering Farm and the growth of market gardens/garden market.	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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB10	The proposals for Mayford would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford. The area has already been damaged by Havering Farm and the growth of market gardens/garden market.	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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB11	The proposals for Mayford would lead to the gradual merging of Woking and Guildford. The area has already been damaged by Havering Farm and the growth of market	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				gardens/garden market.		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.	
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB8	Proposals will damage the natural environment including wildlife on 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB9	Proposals will damage the natural environment including wildlife on 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB10	Proposals will damage the natural environment including wildlife on 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
310	Brian	Sheppard	GB11	Proposals will damage the natural environment including wildlife on 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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>	
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB8	Supports the provision of a new school at Egley road but is concerned that traffic problems will be exacerbated-particularly combined with traffic from new residential proposals.	None stated.	<p>The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB7	The proposals will exacerbate road safety issues- particularly on Saunders Lane. The concentration of development will increase traffic on the narrow, windy roads increasing the risk of road safety for pedestrians and road users	None stated.	<p>The proposed school application was accompanied with a Transport Assessment and Travel Plans, to assess the impact of the development on the local transport network. The County Highway authority did not raise any objection to the application subject to conditions. Planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to 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
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB8	The proposed density for sites along Saunders Lane are higher than existing. Concerned of significant increase in traffic from new proposals will have a negative impact on road safety.	None stated.	<p>The proposed school application was accompanied with a Transport Assessment and Travel Plans, to assess the impact of the development on the local transport network. The County Highway authority did not raise any objection to the application subject to conditions. Planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough</p>	No further modification is 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 set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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>	
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB9	The proposed density for sites along Saunders Lane are higher than existing. Concerned of significant increase in traffic from new proposals will have a negative impact on road safety.	None stated.	<p>The proposed school application was accompanied with a Transport Assessment and Travel Plans, to assess the impact of the development on the local transport network. The County Highway authority did not raise any objection to the application subject to conditions. Planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB10	The proposed density for sites along Saunders Lane are higher than existing. Concerned of significant increase in traffic from new proposals will have a negative impact on road safety.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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>	
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB11	The proposed density for sites along Saunders Lane are higher than existing. Concerned of significant increase in traffic from new proposals will have a negative impact on road safety.	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
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB14	The proposed density for sites along Saunders Lane are higher than existing. Concerned of significant increase in traffic from new proposals will have a negative impact on road safety.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB7	The GB around Hook Heath and Mayford are integral to its character and serves an important function of preventing urban sprawl here	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB8	GB is important to the character of Hook Heath and Mayford. It serves an important GB function to prevent urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB9	GB is important to the character of Hook Heath and Mayford. It serves an important GB function to prevent urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB10	GB is important to the character of Hook Heath and Mayford. It serves an important GB function to prevent urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB11	GB is important to the character of Hook Heath and Mayford. It serves an important GB function to prevent urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB14	GB is important to the character of Hook Heath and Mayford. It serves an important GB function to prevent urban sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0, 12.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB7	The proposed release of GB to accommodate a further 1200 homes has not been justified. The Core Strategy only identifies the need to meet 550 in 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 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB8	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. This exceeds the housing need identified in the Core Strategy.	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
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB9	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. This exceeds the housing need identified in the Core Strategy.	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
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB10	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. This exceeds the housing need identified in the Core Strategy.	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
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB11	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. This exceeds the housing need identified in the Core Strategy.	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
1251	Neil	Sheridan	GB14	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for an additional 1200 houses in Woking. This exceeds the housing need identified in the Core Strategy.	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
492	C	Sherlock	GB12	The improved school at Pyrford this is at full capacity - where are the new children going to be educated? The recently built health centre in West Byfleet would fail to cope with the new development.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
492	C	Sherlock	GB13	The improved school at Pyrford this is at full capacity - where are the new children going to be educated? The recently built health centre in West Byfleet would fail to cope with the new development.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
492	C	Sherlock	GB12	Objects to the proposed dwellings due to the additional cars that will be generated on already overcrowded roads.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
492	C	Sherlock	GB13	Objects to the proposed dwellings due to the additional cars that will be generated on already overcrowded roads.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
492	C	Sherlock	GB12	The field should be left as Green Belt.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs 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
492	C	Sherlock	GB13	The field should be left as Green Belt.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs 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
1502	Kimberly	Shiel	GB4	Objects to the proposals and currently following the matter to see how the Council rules. Has a firm of solicitors retained to advise and exercise any legal rights residents have at their disposal. With recent statements from the Government on Green Belt land protection, I hope WBC will do the right thing and not allow this development to go ahead.	None stated.	Comments 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
1502	Kimberly	Shiel	GB5	Objects to the proposals and currently following the matter to see how the Council rules. Has a firm of solicitors retained to advise and exercise any legal rights residents have at their disposal. With recent statements from the Government on Green Belt land protection, I hope WBC will do the right thing and not allow this development to go ahead.	None stated.	Comments 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
1584	Lynda	Shore	General	Very concerned about removing land from the Green Belt for building as it will set a precedent and make it easier to take future land in the future. I therefore object to these parts of the proposal and the intention to build over large parts of Mayford.	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
1584	Lynda	Shore	General	The reason for building on the Green Belt is for more housing but it does not explain the intention to build a car factory on Green Belt land in Chobham nor why so many brownfield sites stand undeveloped, e.g. the old Knaphill Library site.	Many brownfield sites remain undeveloped such as the old Knaphill Library site.	The Council is not proposing to allocate a site in the Green Belt for commercial uses. The car factory referred to in the representation relates to the a planning application that was determined through the development management process. The scheme was determined on its own merits and the case for very special circumstances for development in the Green Belt was put forward by the applicant. The Council has carried out a comprehensive assessment of the brownfield sites in the Borough. This is set out within Section 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper as well as the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The Old Knaphill Library Site has not been included within the Site Allocations DPD as it falls below the 10 unit residential threshold. Nevertheless the Council is aware of the site and proposed development and the site is listed within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB12	The Borough has departed from Peter Brett Associates (the GBR) recommendation on the release of Green Belt, which is difficult to understand and raises questions as to how it can be justified.	None stated.	Nevertheless this site (a number of the proposed allocations) will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB13	The Borough has departed from Peter Brett Associates (the GBR) recommendation on the release of Green Belt, which is difficult to understand and raises questions as to how it can be justified.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB12	The proposals will adversely affect the unique charm, special character, natural lancape and relatively unspoilt countryside of Pyrford, which benefits the whole Borough.	None stated.	The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB13	The proposals will adversely affect the unique charm, special character, natural landscape and relatively unspoilt countryside of Pyrford, which benefits the whole Borough.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB12	The imposition of 400+ new houses will seriously increase traffic problems on already congested roads, especially in the village centre, and put extra pressure on local infrastructure that is already at full capacity (particularly the nursery and primary school).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB13	The imposition of 400+ new houses will seriously increase traffic problems on already congested roads, especially in the village centre, and put extra pressure on local infrastructure that is already at full capacity (particularly the nursery and primary school).	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, and in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB12	The removal of Green Belt status could cause irreparable damage to the conservation areas in Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB13	The removal of Green Belt status could cause irreparable damage to the conservation areas in Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB12	The proposals will be contrary to the Government's intention for the Green Belt, in checking unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	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 comment is further addressed in Section 15.0 and 21.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB13	The proposals will be contrary to the Government's intention for the Green Belt, in checking unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.	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 comment is further addressed in Section 15.0 and 21.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB12	Loves the area for its natural beauty and close community spirit.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB13	Loves the area for its natural beauty and close community spirit.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB12	Objects to the proposals. The Borough has ignored the Pyrford neighbourhood Forum's two letters raising concern about the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1410	Brian	Shreeve	GB13	Objects to the proposals. The Borough has ignored the Pyrford neighbourhood Forum's two letters raising concern about the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	As noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. Responding to this (Regulation 18) consultation is the correct method and time for residents, groups and all other stakeholders to voice their concerns.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
63	Rico	Signore	GB12	Strongly object to the proposed development of the Upshot Lane Area, as 400+ new houses means at least 800+ more cars in our area, served by predominantly country lanes (see Warren Lane), which are already overused by local, shopping and school traffic – how do you intend to solve this ever-increasing problem?	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
63	Rico	Signore	GB12	Schools in the area are already short of spaces for local children, so additional families with children will severely restrict available places.	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
63	Rico	Signore	GB12	Access to a GP at the West Byfleet Health Centre is increasingly difficult – certainly if you wish to see a doctor the same day! With around 1000+ more residents/patients/children it will soon become increasingly difficult to obtain an appointment with your (or any) GP!	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
63	Rico	Signore	GB12	Parking facilities for shoppers and visitors to West Byfleet are virtually exhausted – try and find anywhere to park your car on a Friday - it can take a lot of time and is often the reason appointments are attended late or are even cancelled.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
63	Rico	Signore	GB12	We have been residents of Pyrford for more than 40 years and would hate to lose the green aspect and rural feel of the area. Why do subsequent governments always promise to honour the Green Belt but as soon as elected renege on this promise by favouring unwanted developments encroaching on the “sacred” Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The proposals can be developed without undermining the lancape character of the area. This particular issues is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
63	Rico	Signore	GB13	Strongly object to the proposed development of the Upshot Lane Area, as 400+ new houses means at least 800+ more cars in our area, served by predominantly country lanes (see Warren Lane), which are already overused by local, shopping and school traffic – how do you intend to solve this ever-increasing problem?	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
63	Rico	Signore	GB13	Schools in the area are already short of spaces for local children, so additional families with children will severely restrict available places.	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
63	Rico	Signore	GB13	Access to a GP at the West Byfleet Health Centre is increasingly difficult – certainly if you wish to see a doctor the same day! With around 1000+ more residents/patients/children it will soon become increasingly difficult to obtain an appointment with your (or any) GP!	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
63	Rico	Signore	GB13	Parking facilities for shoppers and visitors to West Byfleet are virtually exhausted – try and find anywhere to park your car on a Friday - it can take a lot of time and is often the reason appointments are attended late or are even cancelled.	None stated.	The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
63	Rico	Signore	GB13	We have been residents of Pyrford for more than 40 years and would hate to lose the green aspect and rural feel of the area. Why do subsequent governments always promise to honour the Green Belt but as soon as elected renege on this promise by favouring unwanted developments encroaching on the “sacred” Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	The proposals are unsustainable with the existing infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The proposals are unsustainable with the existing infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	The proposals are unsustainable with the existing infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	The proposals are unsustainable with the existing infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	The proposals are unsustainable with the existing infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	The proposals will destroy the openness of the lancape and the boundary between the town and village which the Green Belt was intended to protect.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraphs 7.3 - 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The proposals will destroy the openness of the lancape and the boundary between the town and village which the Green Belt was intended to protect.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraphs 7.3 - 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	The proposals will destroy the openness of the lancape and the boundary between the town and village which the Green Belt was intended to protect.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraphs 7.3 - 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	The proposals will destroy the openness of the lancape and the boundary between the town and village which the Green Belt was intended to protect.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraphs 7.3 - 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	The proposals will destroy the openness of the lancape and the boundary between the town and village which the Green Belt was intended to protect.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, paragraphs 7.3 - 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	The percentage of affordable houses is given as 50%, a very high figure for any planning application, let alone to build alongside £1 million homes.	None stated.	The affordable housing requirement for the site is based on Core Strategy Policy CS12. There is a significant need for housing and in particular, affordable housing in the Borough. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). In order to create balanced communities, Core Strategy Policy CS11 seeks to secure a sustainable range of dwellings on individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	The percentage of affordable houses is given as 50%, a very high figure for any planning application, let alone to build alongside £1 million homes.	None stated.	The affordable housing requirement for the site is based on Core Strategy Policy CS12. There is a significant need for housing and in particular, affordable housing in the Borough. This is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). In order to create balanced communities, Core Strategy Policy CS11 seeks to secure a sustainable range of dwellings on individual sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Asks what is classed as an affordable house. If it is £100,000 you will be building one bedroom flats and back to back houses. The average house price is nearer £400,000 in Woking - is this affordable?	None stated.	<p>Affordable housing is clearly defined in the NPPF. It states that affordable housing is 'Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. More information is also provided with the Core Strategy and the Affordable Housing Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land 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>meet the identified need.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types and tenures based on local needs.</p>	
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Asks what is classed as an affordable house. If it is £100,000 you will be building one bedroom flats and back to back houses. The average house price is nearer £400,000 in Woking - is this affordable?	None stated.	<p>Affordable housing is clearly defined in the NPPF. It states that affordable housing is 'Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. More information is also provided with the Core Strategy and the Affordable Housing Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types and tenures based on local needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Asks whether the planning department plans to ensure the new housing estate is compatible with Saunders Lane houses, or will the developer be allowed to pack in as many houses as possible and create another Goldsworth Park, of bland identikit homes?	None stated.	<p>The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that development is of a high standard and responds to local character. This includes Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24, the Development Management Policies DPD as well as the Design SPD. In addition, the key requirements for the site set out in the Site Allocations DPD states a number of key design and lancape criteria that must be addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The exact number of houses on the site will also be considered at the planning application stage. However it will be required to comply with the policies of the Development Plan including the densities set out in CS10 as well as the housing mix set out in CS11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Asks whether the planning department plans to ensure the new housing estate is compatible with Saunders Lane houses, or will the developer be allowed to pack in as many houses as possible and create another Goldsworth Park, of bland identikit homes?	None stated.	<p>The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that development is of a high standard and responds to local character. This includes Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24, the Development Management Policies DPD as well as the Design SPD. In addition, the key requirements for the site set out in the Site Allocations DPD states a number of key design and lancape criteria that must be addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The exact number of houses on the site will also be considered at the planning application stage. However it will be required to comply with the policies of the Development Plan including the densities set out in CS10 as well as the housing mix set out in CS11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Access proposed for the houses will add significant additional traffic on already congested roads, and proposed pavements and cycle facilities will narrow the A320 and further add to delays and congestion.	None stated.	This representation 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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	States that the definition of an arterial road is: like an artery delivering traffic swiftly around the system. Adding a pedestrian crossing, in part for children to get to school, is NOT compatible with this role and will delay traffic even further. This would impact on business, make people late for appointments and work, and create illegal levels of air pollution.	None stated.	This representation 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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	The proposal makes provision for industrial use on the site, most likely consisting of unsightly and environmentally	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				unfriendly reclamation work. There is no provision in the proposal for environment health involvement. These kind of activities attract rats which will spill out into the surrounding neighbourhood. Objects to the proposal on these grounds.		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.	of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The proposal states that the intended catchment for the school overcomes barriers to good non-vehicular access in approaches from the west. In view of the fact that this is not the case [the intended catchment taking in sites GB10 and GB11, to the west of GB8], the Highway Authority should be alerted that children will not be coming to school as stated. If building is not permitted on the Green Belt, as recently stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, then the proposal's statement above cannot be true as children will be coming to school by car because the school will have to recruit pupils from the whole county to fill 840 places, burdening traffic on the A320 at peak times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The report refers to a green corridor from the leisure facilities, and an 800metre cordon sanitaire has to be provided by law around schools and leisure sites. The proposal to put houses on the site would breach that space.	None stated.	The Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities at this site outlines that the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. The Council is unaware of a 800m separation law or 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, and will be used to ensure effective layout of future residential uses on the site, in relation to the school and leisure facilities. The design and layout of the school and leisure facilities has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority, which has granted planning permission (the decision was not called in by the Secretary of State).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The proposal states that Surrey County Education service supports the provision of a new secondary school due to need in the South Woking area. The school set up on the temporary site at the Leisure Centre is heavily recruiting pupils from way outside Woking to fill places. The intended catchment of the school (never properly explained by the Council) is from children living in housing proposed on sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11	None stated.	The catchment area for the proposed school has been addressed in the Officers Report to the Planning Committee for the application. See Section VSC1 – need for secondary school places. The need for an additional secondary school in the Borough is set out in the IDP and supported by Surrey County Council. The Green belt review considered that based on the location of the site close to the existing urban area this site is suitable for an educational facility.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Strongly objects to the proposals and intends to make complaints elsewhere on the highway issues. The proposals show no concern for or care for the environment, flow of traffic on the A320, or infrastructure, nor for people living in the area and massive congestion on an essential arterial road. The proposals are a travesty and worse than anything expected from WBC.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Strongly objects to the proposals and intends to make complaints elsewhere on the highway issues. The proposals show no concern for or care for the environment, flow of traffic on the A320, or infrastructure, nor for people living in the area and massive congestion on an essential arterial road. The proposals are a travesty and worse than anything expected from WBC.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Strongly objects to the proposals and intends to make complaints elsewhere on the highway issues. The proposals show no concern for or care for the environment, flow of traffic on the A320, or infrastructure, nor for people living in the area and massive congestion on an essential arterial road. The proposals are a travesty and worse than anything expected from WBC.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Strongly objects to the proposals and intends to make complaints elsewhere on the highway issues. The proposals show no concern for or care for the environment, flow of traffic on the A320, or infrastructure, nor for people living in	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 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 area and massive congestion on an essential arterial road. The proposals are a travesty and worse than anything expected from WBC.			
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Contends the statement "Surrey county Council Education Service has confirmed its support for the provision of a new secondary school on this site to serve families in the South Woking area". The writers do not understand that the purpose of a Free school is that it is free of County Council control, and is why the planning application came before WBC and not SCC. It is Woking making the application for the school, not Surrey, with funding from central Government. The fact that the writers do not understand this fundamental concept throws serious doubt about the competence of the rest of the document.	None stated.	As clearly set out in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school on the site, Surrey County Council, as the education authority for the area, has confirmed that there is a need for a secondary school in the Borough to meet the future needs of local people. Although the proposed school is a Free School and will not be under SCC control, as education authority for the area, they advise Woking Borough Council on education needs and forecasts. Therefore the County Education Authority's views on the proposed school were an important element in assessing the proposed scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Writing to confirm information given about the density of housing being 30 dwellings per hectare, much higher than the density of houses on Saunders Lane or Hook Heath Road	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.	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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Writing to confirm information given about the density of housing being 30 dwellings per hectare, much higher than the density of houses on Saunders Lane or Hook Heath Road	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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	States that children do not walk or cycle to school anywhere in the UK. Parents will not want their children to cycle along busy, dangerous arterial roads.	None stated.	The impact of the site allocations on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, this has also been addressed in the Officer Report to the Planning Committee when the site was granted planning permission in early 2016. At this stage the County Highways Authority agreed that the proposed development would not have a significant negative impact on the road network that could not be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	The proposals will severely affect house prices of properties on Hook Heath and Saunders Lane.	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The proposals will severely affect house prices of properties on Hook Heath and Saunders Lane.	None stated.	This is not a planning material consideration	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	The proposals will severely affect house prices of properties on Hook Heath and Saunders Lane.	None stated.	This is not a planning material consideration	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	The proposals will severely affect house prices of properties on Hook Heath and Saunders Lane.	None stated.	This is not a planning material consideration	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	The proposals will severely affect house prices of properties on Hook Heath and Saunders Lane.	None stated.	This is not a planning material consideration	No further modification is 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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Making 50% new homes affordable will mean higher densities than those specified, and potentially high rise flats and back to back houses.	None stated.	This would not necessarily be the case. The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character. 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. Also please refer to Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Making 50% new homes affordable will mean higher densities than those specified, and potentially high rise flats and back to back houses.	None stated.	This would not necessarily be the case. The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character. 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. Also please refer to Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Making 50% new homes affordable will mean higher densities than those specified, and potentially high rise flats and back to back houses.	None stated.	This would not necessarily be the case. The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character. 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. Also please refer to Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Making 50% new homes affordable will mean higher densities than those specified, and potentially high rise flats and back to back houses.	None stated.	This would not necessarily be the case. The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character. 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. Also please refer to Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	More people would use the train from Worplesdon station if there was a better, tarmacked and well lit path to the station, making it safe and easier to walk (without having to take hiking boots and a torch!) and preferable to driving to Woking and paying high parking charges.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	More people would use the train from Worplesdon station if there was a better, tarmacked and well lit path to the station, making it safe and easier to walk (without having to take hiking boots and a torch!) and preferable to driving to Woking and paying high parking charges.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	More people would use the train from Worplesdon station if there was a better, tarmacked and well lit path to the station, making it safe and easier to walk (without having to take hiking boots and a torch!) and preferable to driving to Woking and paying high parking charges.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	More people would use the train from Worplesdon station if there was a better, tarmacked and well lit path to the station, making it safe and easier to walk (without having to take hiking boots and a torch!) and preferable to driving to Woking and paying high parking charges.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	No one has defined what an affordable home it, but if the Council plans to build affordable homes in the £100,000-£200,000 bracket they will be one bedroom flats and back to back houses on land deliberately kept Green by Government policy for 70 years. States that the Council is hiding the truth	None stated.	The National Planning Policy Framework (see www.gov.uk/guidance/definitions-of-general-housing-terms) together with recent government updates, define affordable housing. The Draft Site Allocations DPD is considered to be clear and transparent about the development proposed at each site. The Council recognise the special character of Mayford in its Development Plan, with Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlighting that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				under statements like 'It is important that the development complements that of other Mayford allocated and safeguarded sites, to ensure effective integration and sustainable development'. Questions how development can be sustainable at that density and in that situation.		character of the village. and this would be a very real consideration for any proposed development. Proposed densities are covered in Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	No one has defined what an affordable home it, but if the Council plans to build affordable homes in the £100,000-£200,000 bracket they will be one bedroom flats and back to back houses on land deliberately kept Green by Government policy for 70 years. States that the Council is hiding the truth under statements like 'It is important that the development complements that of other Mayford allocated and safeguarded sites, to ensure effective integration and sustainable development'. Questions how development can be sustainable at that density and in that situation.	None stated.	The National Planning Policy Framework (see www.gov.uk/guidance/definitions-of-general-housing-terms) together with recent government updates, define affordable housing. The Draft Site Allocations DPD is considered to be clear and transparent about the development proposed at each site. The Council recognise the special character of Mayford in its Development Plan, with Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlighting that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village. and this would be a very real consideration for any proposed development. Proposed densities are covered in Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	No one has defined what an affordable home it, but if the Council plans to build affordable homes in the £100,000-£200,000 bracket they will be one bedroom flats and back to back houses on land deliberately kept Green by Government policy for 70 years. States that the Council is hiding the truth under statements like 'It is important that the development complements that of other Mayford allocated and safeguarded sites, to ensure effective integration and sustainable development'. Questions how development can be sustainable at that density and in that situation.	None stated.	The National Planning Policy Framework (see www.gov.uk/guidance/definitions-of-general-housing-terms) together with recent government updates, define affordable housing. The Draft Site Allocations DPD is considered to be clear and transparent about the development proposed at each site. The Council recognise the special character of Mayford in its Development Plan, with Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlighting that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village. and this would be a very real consideration for any proposed development. Proposed densities are covered in Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	No one has defined what an affordable home it, but if the Council plans to build affordable homes in the £100,000-£200,000 bracket they will be one bedroom flats and back to back houses on land deliberately kept Green by Government policy for 70 years. States that the Council is hiding the truth under statements like 'It is important that the development complements that of other Mayford allocated and safeguarded sites, to ensure effective integration and sustainable development'. Questions how development can be sustainable at that density and in that situation.	None stated.	The National Planning Policy Framework (see www.gov.uk/guidance/definitions-of-general-housing-terms) together with recent government updates, define affordable housing. The Draft Site Allocations DPD is considered to be clear and transparent about the development proposed at each site. The Council recognise the special character of Mayford in its Development Plan, with Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlighting that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village. and this would be a very real consideration for any proposed development. Proposed densities are covered in Section 18.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Saunders Lane is a street of great charm before it has evolved over decades and contains houses of all ages, types and sizes.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that this will be ruined by the proposals. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Saunders Lane is a street of great charm before it has evolved over decades and contains houses of all ages, types and sizes.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that this will be ruined by the proposals. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	Objects to the proposals, which are part of a strategy to mitigate the Council's extreme indebtedness by taking land out of the Green Belt and packing on as many houses and flats on protected land, to increase Council tax receipts. Both developers and Government are driving this.	None stated.	This is not the case. The reasons and justification releasing land from the Green Belt for development is comprehensively addressed in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Objects to the proposals, which are part of a strategy to mitigate the Council's extreme indebtedness by taking land out of the Green Belt and packing on as many houses and flats on protected land, to increase Council tax receipts. Both developers and Government are driving this.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Objects to the proposals, which are part of a strategy to mitigate the Council's extreme indebtedness by taking land out of the Green Belt and packing on as many houses and flats on protected land, to increase Council tax receipts. Both developers and Government are driving this.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Objects to the proposals, which are part of a strategy to mitigate the Council's extreme indebtedness by taking land out of the Green Belt and packing on as many houses and flats on protected land, to increase Council tax receipts. Both developers and Government are driving this.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Objects to the proposals, which are part of a strategy to mitigate the Council's extreme indebtedness by taking land out of the Green Belt and packing on as many houses and flats on protected land, to increase Council tax receipts. Both developers and Government are driving this.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Land slopes steeply upwards from Saunders Lane to Hook Hill and causes significant water run off. Development, concreting the slopes and felling trees will increase the risk of flooding to the whole road [Saunders Lane]. Seeking legal advice as to whether WBC could be sued should the south of Saunders Lane flood due to the dense housebuilding in these proposals.	None stated.	It should be noted that this site is an operational garden centre with the majority of its area already hard surfaced or concreted. Therefore its development would not necessarily create additional run-off, and in fact through its key requirement for the provision of open space and green infrastructure, may help to alleviate surface water run-off. The key requirements will, if adopted, become part of the Borough's Development Plan, with statutory weight and are in addition to the policy approach already in place in the Council's Core Strategy (CS9). Further flooding issues are dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Land slopes steeply upwards from Saunders Lane to Hook Hill and causes significant water run off. Development, concreting the slopes and felling trees will increase the risk of flooding to the whole road [Saunders Lane]. Seeking legal advice as to whether WBC could be sued should the south of Saunders Lane flood due to the dense housebuilding in these proposals.	None stated.	The key requirements listed within the draft allocation includes retaining protecting trees and tree belts, not only 'amenity trees' as argued. These criteria will, if adopted, become part of the Borough's Development Plan, with statutory weight. Flooding issues are dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Land slopes steeply upwards from Saunders Lane to Hook Hill and causes significant water run off. Development, concreting the slopes and felling trees will increase the risk of flooding to the whole road [Saunders Lane]. Seeking legal advice as to whether WBC could be sued should the south of Saunders Lane flood due to the dense housebuilding in these proposals.	None stated.	The key requirements listed within the draft allocation includes trees safeguarded by TPO, not only 'amenity trees' as argued. However, the wording of this criteria would be clearer if stated in the same manner as in the Key Requirements on site GB8, in terms of retaining trees. Modified wording is proposed to this effect. These criteria will, if adopted, become part of the Borough's Development Plan, with statutory weight. Flooding issues are dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	Modify Key Requirement 'Trees are safeguarded by a Tree Preservation Order' to 'Retain protected trees and tree belts and strengthen with planting to enhance the site's landscape character'.

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Land slopes steeply upwards from Saunders Lane to Hook Hill and causes significant water run off. Development, concreting the slopes and felling trees will increase the risk of flooding to the whole road [Saunders Lane]. Seeking legal advice as to whether WBC could be sued should the south of Saunders Lane flood due to the dense housebuilding in these proposals.	None stated.	The key requirements listed within the draft allocation includes trees safeguarded by TPO, not only 'amenity trees' as argued. However, the wording of this criteria would be clearer if stated in the same manner as in the Key Requirements on site GB8, in terms of retaining trees. Modified wording is proposed to this effect. These criteria will, if adopted, become part of the Borough's Development Plan, with statutory weight. Flooding issues are dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	Modify Key Requirement 'Trees are safeguarded by a Tree Preservation Order' to 'Retain protected trees and tree belts and strengthen with planting to enhance the site's lancape character'.
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Quotes para 79 of the NPPF on the importance given to Green Belts in preventing urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open, and para 83 on only altering established Green Belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances. The proposals contradict this, which the Chancellor George Osborne recently states he wanted to adhere to.	None stated.	Comment noted. 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. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Quotes para 79 of the NPPF on the importance given to Green Belts in preventing urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open, and para 83 on only altering established Green Belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances. The proposals contradict this, which the Chancellor George Osborne recently states he wanted to adhere to.	None stated.	Comment noted. 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. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Quotes para 79 of the NPPF on the importance given to Green Belts in preventing urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open, and para 83 on only altering established Green Belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances. The proposals contradict this, which the Chancellor George Osborne recently states he wanted to adhere to.	None stated.	Comment noted. 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. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Quotes para 79 of the NPPF on the importance given to Green Belts in preventing urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open, and para 83 on only altering established Green Belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances. The proposals contradict this, which the Chancellor George Osborne recently states he wanted to adhere to.	None stated.	Comment noted. 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. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The proposal for a crossing [across the A320] conflicts with GB11 and GB10 which indicates that children for the school will come from this Green Belt housing development by non-vehicular means (walk or cycle). Why would these children even need a pedestrian crossing?	None stated.	While a proportion of children attending the school would come from the proposed housing development, the school is expected to serve wider educational need in the south Woking area. It should also be noted that the sports and leisure facilities located at the site will provide infrastructure to the wider community. A pedestrian crossing would facilitate safe linkages to the school and leisure facilities for both children and adults needing to cross the road.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	The proposal for a crossing [across the A320] conflicts with GB11 and GB10 which indicates that children for the school will come from this Green Belt housing development by non-vehicular means (walk or cycle). Why would these children even need a pedestrian crossing?	None stated.	While a proportion of children attending the school would come from the proposed housing development, the school is expected to serve wider educational need in the south Woking area. It should also be noted that the sports and leisure facilities located at the site will provide infrastructure to the wider community. A pedestrian crossing would facilitate safe linkages to the school and leisure facilities for both children and adults needing to cross the road.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	The proposal for a crossing [across the A320] conflicts with GB11 and GB10 which indicates that children for the school will come from this Green Belt housing development by non-vehicular means (walk or cycle). Why would these children even need a pedestrian crossing?	None stated.	While a proportion of children attending the school would come from the proposed housing development, the school is expected to serve wider educational need in the south Woking area. It should also be noted that the sports and leisure facilities located at the site will provide infrastructure to the wider community. A pedestrian crossing would facilitate safe linkages to the school and leisure facilities for both children and adults needing to cross the road.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	The proposal involves considerable work to raise the land on the flood plain by 300mm, involving movement of hard core and soil. The flood plan is intended to flood and if the land is raised as proposed, water will be displaced and flood elsewhere. WBC should explain where the water will be displaced to, as this is missing alongside adequate assessment of flood risk and testing of proposals. Suspects that floodwater will be displaced into nearby homes, who will take the flak from the policy for GB7.	None stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. Flooding is addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	There is little understanding or research behind the documents with regard to the impact of additional traffic on local roads. Many of these are narrow and at two points of restriction, over railway bridges, are single lane, and will not sustain extra pressure from increased number of cars.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	There is little understanding or research behind the documents with regard to the impact of additional traffic on local roads. Many of these are narrow and at two points of restriction, over railway bridges, are single lane, and will not sustain extra pressure from increased number of cars.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	There is little understanding or research behind the documents with regard to the impact of additional traffic on local roads. Many of these are narrow but no mention has been made in the proposal for GB11 about the restriction to traffic at two points, over railway bridges, which are single lane, and will not sustain extra pressure from increased number of cars.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	There is little understanding or research behind the documents with regard to the impact of additional traffic on local roads. Many of these are narrow and at two points of restriction, over railway bridges, are single lane, and will not sustain extra pressure from increased number of cars. The density proposed at this site is even higher than at GB10 and 11, meaning flats or terraced houses, and cannot imagine what "the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the impacts of the development of this site" means. CIL is definitely something WBC would want to get their hands on.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Sections 8.0 and 9.0 outline the evidence, research and assessment supporting the Draft Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Contends that the description of houses on Saunders Lane as 'ribbon development' as poorly founded, and not based on reality where houses have large gardens and a density of 6 dph, rather than 30 dph. Defines ribbon development as 'modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads'. Houses on Saunders Lane have evolved over centuries and include houses of different periods, types and styles, which lends it charm.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Contends that the description of houses on Saunders Lane as 'ribbon development' as poorly founded, and not based on reality where houses have large gardens and a density of 6 dph, rather than 30 dph. Defines ribbon development as 'modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads'. Houses on Saunders Lane have evolved over centuries and include houses of different periods, types and styles, which lends it charm.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Contends that the description of houses on Saunders Lane as 'ribbon development' as poorly founded, and not based on reality where houses have large gardens and a density of 6 dph, rather than 30 dph. Defines ribbon development as 'modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads'. Houses on Saunders Lane have evolved over centuries and include houses of different periods, types and styles, which lends it charm.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Contends that the description of houses on Saunders Lane as 'ribbon development' as poorly founded, and not based on reality where houses have large gardens and a density of 6 dph, rather than 30 dph. Defines ribbon development as 'modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads'. Houses on Saunders Lane have evolved over centuries and include houses of different periods, types and styles, which lends it charm.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Site GB10 refers to an existing bus service, however this is an unreliable and slow service and poorly used, meaning there is little incentive for the bus company to improve it. Most people in Mayford have cars, and respondent cannot see that changing.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the deficiencies in the existing bus services in some areas of the Borough, and is working with other partners to improve that. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Site GB10 refers to an existing bus service, however this is an unreliable and slow service and poorly used, meaning there is little incentive for the bus company to improve it. Most people in Mayford have cars, and respondent cannot see that changing.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the deficiencies in the existing bus services in some areas of the Borough, and is working with other partners to improve that. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Site GB10 refers to an existing bus service, however this is an unreliable and slow service and poorly used, meaning there is little incentive for the bus company to improve it. Most people in Mayford have cars, and respondent cannot see that changing.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the deficiencies in the existing bus services in some areas of the Borough, and is working with other partners to improve that. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Site GB10 refers to an existing bus service, however this is an unreliable and slow service and poorly used, meaning there is little incentive for the bus company to improve it. Most people in Mayford have cars, and respondent cannot see that changing.	None stated.	The Council is aware of the deficiencies in the existing bus services in some areas of the Borough, and is working with other partners to improve that. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The Council proposed to take land out of the Green Belt to build housing at a density which is out of character with the area. This will create extra car movements and traffic on already congested roads.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 18.0. 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. Also the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	The Council proposed to take land out of the Green Belt to build housing at a density which is out of character with the area. This will create extra car movements and traffic on already congested roads.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 18.0. 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. Also the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	The Council proposed to take land out of the Green Belt to build housing at a density which is out of character with the area. This will create extra car movements and traffic on already congested roads.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 18.0. 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. Also the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	The Council proposed to take land out of the Green Belt to build housing at a density which is out of character with the area. This will create extra car movements and traffic on already congested roads.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 18.0. 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. Also the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties	No further modification is 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 positively contributes to local character.	
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	The shopping centre and community facilities proposed to mitigate harm from the development shows the limited vision of Council officers. These shops would not be able to compete with an excess of nearby shops, so would sit empty and fail to yield the intended business tax. There is already a well used Village Hall, so why would more community facilities be needed? And south Woking already has plenty of leisure facilities.	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 as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floorspace over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	The shopping centre and community facilities proposed to mitigate harm from the development shows the limited vision of Council officers. These shops would not be able to compete with an excess of nearby shops, so would sit empty and fail to yield the intended business tax. There is already a well used Village Hall, so why would more community facilities be needed? And south Woking already has plenty of leisure facilities.	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 as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floorspace over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	The shopping centre and community facilities proposed to mitigate harm from the development shows the limited vision of Council officers. These shops would not be able to compete with an excess of nearby shops, so would sit empty and fail to yield the intended business tax. There is already a well used Village Hall, so why would more community facilities be needed? And south Woking already has plenty of leisure facilities.	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 as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floorspace over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	The shopping centre and community facilities proposed to mitigate harm from the development shows the limited vision of Council officers. These shops would not be able to compete with an excess of nearby shops, so would sit empty and fail to yield the intended business tax. There is already a well used Village Hall, so why would more community facilities be needed? And south Woking already has plenty of leisure facilities.	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 as well as 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>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floorspace over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Where children need to cross busy roads to get to school in London their Councils have the sense and vision to create a safe crossing in the form of the bridge.	None stated.	<p>The Council has and will continue to work with the County Highways Authority to ensure that the proposed allocations will not have a significant impact on the network. It should be noted that a number of A roads contain pedestrian crossings, including locally, the A320 in Woking Town Centre and the A245 in Byfleet and West Byfleet.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	Woking has already added to its population by 100,000 through development in Brookwood, Knaphill and other places and is now one of the most densely populated small towns in Surrey.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Woking has already added to its population by 100,000 through development in Brookwood, Knaphill and other places and is now one of the most densely populated small towns in Surrey.	None stated.	<p>The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Woking has already added to its population by 100,000 through development in Brookwood, Knaphill and other places and is now one of the most densely populated small towns in Surrey.	None stated.	<p>The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Woking has already added to its population by 100,000 through development in Brookwood, Knaphill and other places and is now one of the most densely populated small towns in Surrey.	None stated.	<p>The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future 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
						needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Woking has already added to its population by 100,000 through development in Brookwood, Knaphill and other places and is now one of the most densely populated small towns in Surrey.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Woking set on driving business out of the town while bringing in thousands more houses and flats, creating nothing but a dormitory with nowhere for people to work.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Woking set on driving business out of the town while bringing in thousands more houses and flats, creating nothing but a dormitory with nowhere for people to work.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Woking set on driving business out of the town while bringing in thousands more houses and flats, creating nothing but a dormitory with nowhere for people to work.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Woking set on driving business out of the town while bringing in thousands more houses and flats, creating nothing but a dormitory with nowhere for people to work.	None stated.	The proposals are specifically designed to meet an evidence based local housing need. The Council has carried out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the housing need in the area. There is an objectively assessed housing need for 517 dwellings per year. The housing requirement that the Council is making provision for because of the constraints in the area is 292 dwellings per year. The development proposals are therefore not intended for any other purpose. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB7	Woking's development limitations include the Basingstoke Canal, the Hoe stream and it's flood plain, the Wey navigation and Green Belt.	None stated.	Comment noted. Flood risk is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB8	Woking's development limitations include the Basingstoke Canal, the Hoe stream and it's flood plain, the Wey navigation and Green Belt.	None stated.	Comment noted. Flood risk is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB9	Woking's development limitations include the Basingstoke Canal, the Hoe stream and it's flood plain, the Wey navigation and Green Belt.	None stated.	Comment noted. Flood risk is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB10	Woking's development limitations include the Basingstoke Canal, the Hoe stream and it's flood plain, the Wey navigation and Green Belt.	None stated.	Comment noted. Flood risk is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
571	Sandra	Simkin	GB11	Woking's development limitations include the Basingstoke Canal, the Hoe stream and it's flood plain, the Wey navigation and Green Belt.	None stated.	Comment noted. Flood risk is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	The proposals will significantly increase car usage in the area and the road network will be gridlocked.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						adverse impacts. 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.	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	It is stated that catchment area overcomes the concerns raised by the CHA. This is not the case and the CHA should be alerted that children will not be coming to school as stated. If the school is built on brownfield land as stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, then the statement is not true and all children will be arriving by car as the school will recruit pupils from the whole county to fill its 840 places, further increasing traffic and congestion. If you ask other education authorities, they will confirm that children do not walk to school or cycle but by car as it is too dangerous to cycle along busy arterial roads.	None stated.	<p>The Council note the editorial error and proposed to amend the document to reflect this change.</p> <p>The impact of the site allocations on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, this has also been addressed in the Officer Report to the Planning Committee when the site was granted planning permission in early 2016. At this stage the County Highways Authority agreed that the proposed development would not have a significant negative impact on the road network that could not be mitigated.</p> <p>The representation regarding recent ministerial statements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9.</p>	GB8: Amend Black Bridge Road to Blackhorse Road
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	The site is proposed for a school and housing with a green corridor from the leisure facilities. This is amusing as the whole area will be developed. A 800m buffer has to be provided by law around schools and leisure sites and the proposals would not comply with this. Access onto the Egley Road will be difficult due to the existing traffic and congestion on the road. The proposed pavements and cycle routes will make the roads smaller and a crossing will slow traffic further. The definition of an arterial road is 'like an artery delivering traffic swiftly around the system'. A crossing is not compatible with this and would add to congestion. Pollution levels would also increase and would exceed illegal limits. Due to the negative impact gridlock will have on the local economy, people may sue WBC. A crossing will conflict with the proposals for GB10 and GB11 as children at the school will live in these proposed houses and will walk or cycle to school, therefore why would they need the crossing. In places like London, bridges have been built over busy roads and WBC should consider doing the same.	None stated.	<p>It is worth noting that the Council do not have a 800m separation policy between leisure or school facilities and residential properties. It is highly unlikely that any of the existing schools or leisure facilities in the Borough are more than 800m from residential properties. This could partly be due to the fact the schools and leisure facilities are usually located close to or within residential areas where they support the local population and reduce the need to travel. Through good design and, where necessary mitigation measures, it is possible to achieve a satisfactory relationship between different land uses.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The A320 is classified as an 'A Road'. The definition of an A Road is clearly set out by the Highways Agency. Locally, the County Highways Agency are responsible for the Borough's road network. The Council has and will continue to work with them to ensure that the proposed allocations will not have a significant impact on the network. It should be noted that a number of A roads contain pedestrian crossings, including locally, the A320 in Woking Town Centre and the A245 in Byfleet and West Byfleet.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition, the 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.	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	SCC Education support the proposed school at this location. See my objection to PLAN/2015/0703. The temporary school site is recruiting pupils from outside Woking as it can not fill the places from south Woking children. The catchment area has never been fully explained by WBC, is from the proposed development sites in Mayford.	None stated.	<p>The catchment area for the proposed school has been addressed in the Officers Report to the Planning Committee for the application. See Section VSC1 – need for secondary school places.</p> <p>The need for an additional secondary school in the Borough is set out in the IDP and supported by Surrey County Council. The Green belt review considered that based on the location of the site close to the existing urban area this site is suitable for an educational facility.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	The density proposed is 35 to 40 dph which will result in flats or terraced houses that are out of character for the area. It is Woking's intention to build as many houses as possible without consideration for local character. Unclear what essential transport infrastructure refers to. CIL fun would be of interest to WBC.	None stated.	<p>The draft site allocation states that a development density of 40 dph could be suitable. This would be inline with the indicative density range set out in Core Strategy Policy CS10. It is 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 general character of the surrounding neighbourhood will play an important role in setting the context for any potential development scheme. In line with Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD, development proposals should respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the area paying regards to scale, heights and other building characteristics.</p> <p>The Community Infrastructure Levy is an important source of funding for infrastructure projects across the Borough. This is very clearly set out on the Council's website and within the CIL Charging Schedule. It is also in line with CIL legislation. Without such a source of funding, it would not be possible to ensure that infrastructure keeps up with development. The Regulation 123 List, also on the Council's website, again clearly set out the strategic infrastructure projects the Council intends to fund completely or partly through CIL.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	General	Strongly object to development proposals. Highways complains will be made elsewhere. The plans show no concern for the care of the environment, the flow of traffic, infrastructure or people currently living in the area. It will create traffic congestion and generally the proposals are a travesty and worse than anything I could have expected from WBC.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The representation regarding transport infrastructure has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	Object to the sites being allocated for housing and other uses. The proposals are based on WBC mitigating its extreme indebtedness by increasing council tax receipts. The proposals are at a density that is out of keeping with the surrounding area, unsustainable with the existing infrastructure and will destroy the openness of the lancape. It will also the boundary between the town and Mayford village which is one of the principles of Green Belt. It will affect house prices in the local area. 50% affordable housing requirement will result in high density development of back to back houses and high rise flats. Woking is one of the most dense boroughs in Surrey and too focused on housing building rather than creating local employment opportunities. Woking is limited for development by waterways, Green Belt and flood plains.	None stated.	<p>Woking Borough Council has committed to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to enable the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 dwellings, 28,000sqm of office, 20,000sqm warehouse and 93,900sqm retail floor space between 2010 and 2027. The housing needs for the Borough are clearly set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The representation is correct that the Borough is constrained by various physical features and planning designations including the Green Belt and flood plains. As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed with the Council that the Green Belt should be identified as a direction of future development. The Council therefore consider the draft Site Allocations DPD to be consistent with national policy and working toward addressing the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's approach to infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs.</p> <p>To clarify, the population of Woking Borough is approximately 100,000. Developments noted in the representation in Brookwood and Knaphill have sought to deliver a mix of housing types, again to meet local need. This is important to note as Woking Town Centre will predominantly provide flatted development schemes, whilst other parts of the borough are generally more suitable for family housing.</p> <p>It is important to acknowledge that whilst the focus has been on residential development the Council also has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet its economic requirements. The draft DPD clearly sets out a number sites that are expected to deliver employment opportunities across the Borough.</p>	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	<p>Object to the sites being allocated for housing and other uses. The proposals are based on WBC mitigating its extreme indebtedness by increasing council tax receipts. The proposals are at a density that is out of keeping with the surrounding area, unsustainable with the existing infrastructure and will destroy the openness of the lancape. It will also the boundary between the town and Mayford village which is one of the principles of Green Belt. It will affect house prices in the local area. 50% affordable housing requirement will result in high density development of back to back houses and high rise flats. Woking is one of the most dense boroughs in Surrey and too focused on housing building rather than creating local employment opportunities. Woking is limited for development by waterways, Green Belt and flood plains.</p>	None stated.	<p>Woking Borough Council has committed to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to enable the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 dwellings, 28,000sqm of office, 20,000sqm warehouse and 93,900sqm retail floor space between 2010 and 2027. The housing needs for the Borough are clearly set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The representation is correct that the Borough is constrained by various physical features and planning designations including the Green Belt and flood plains. As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed with the Council that the Green Belt should be identified as a direction of future development. The Council therefore consider the draft Site Allocations DPD to be consistent with national policy and working toward addressing the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's approach to infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs.</p> <p>To clarify, the population of Woking Borough is approximately 100,000. Developments noted in the representation in Brookwood and Knaphill have sought to deliver a mix of housing types, again to meet local need. This is important to note as Woking Town Centre will predominantly provide flatted development schemes, whilst other parts of the borough are generally more suitable for family housing.</p> <p>It is important to acknowledge that whilst the focus has been on residential development the Council also has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet its economic requirements. The draft DPD clearly sets out a number sites that are expected to deliver employment opportunities across the Borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	<p>Object to the sites being allocated for housing and other uses. The proposals are based on WBC mitigating its extreme indebtedness by increasing council tax receipts. The</p>	None stated.	<p>Woking Borough Council has committed to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to enable the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 dwellings, 28,000sqm of office, 20,000sqm warehouse 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>proposals are at a density that is out of keeping with the surrounding area, unsustainable with the existing infrastructure and will destroy the openness of the lancape. It will also the boundary between the town and Mayford village which is one of the principles of Green Belt. It will affect house prices in the local area. 50% affordable housing requirement will result in high density development of back to back houses and high rise flats. Woking is one of the most dense boroughs in Surrey and too focused on housing building rather than creating local employment opportunities. Woking is limited for development by waterways, Green Belt and flood plains.</p>		<p>93,900sqm retail floor space between 2010 and 2027. The housing needs for the Borough are clearly set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The representation is correct that the Borough is constrained by various physical features and planning designations including the Green Belt and flood plains. As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed with the Council that the Green Belt should be identified as a direction of future development. The Council therefore consider the draft Site Allocations DPD to be consistent with national policy and working toward addressing the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's approach to infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs.</p> <p>To clarify, the population of Woking Borough is approximately 100,000. Developments noted in the representation in Brookwood and Knaphill have sought to deliver a mix of housing types, again to meet local need. This is important to note as Woking Town Centre will predominantly provide flatted development schemes, whilst other parts of the borough are generally more suitable for family housing.</p> <p>It is important to acknowledge that whilst the focus has been on residential development the Council also has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet its economic requirements. The draft DPD clearly sets out a number sites that are expected to deliver employment opportunities across the Borough.</p>	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	<p>Object to the sites being allocated for housing and other uses. The proposals are based on WBC mitigating its extreme indebtedness by increasing council tax receipts. The proposals are at a density that is out of keeping with the surrounding area, unsustainable with the existing infrastructure and will destroy the openness of the lancape. It will also the boundary between the town and Mayford village which is one of the principles of Green Belt. It will affect house prices in the local area. 50% affordable housing requirement will result in high density development of back to back houses and high rise flats. Woking is one of the most dense boroughs in Surrey and too focused on housing building rather than creating local employment opportunities. Woking is limited for development by waterways, Green Belt and flood plains.</p>	None stated.	<p>Woking Borough Council has committed to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to enable the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 dwellings, 28,000sqm of office, 20,000sqm warehouse and 93,900sqm retail floor space between 2010 and 2027. The housing needs for the Borough are clearly set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The representation is correct that the Borough is constrained by various physical features and planning designations including the Green Belt and flood plains. As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed with the Council that the Green Belt should be identified as a direction of future development. The Council therefore consider the draft Site Allocations DPD to be consistent with national policy and working toward addressing the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's approach to infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs.</p> <p>To clarify, the population of Woking Borough is approximately 100,000. Developments noted in the representation in Brookwood and Knaphill have sought to deliver a mix of housing types, again to meet local need. This is important to note as Woking Town Centre will predominantly provide flatted development schemes, whilst other parts of the borough are generally more suitable for family housing.</p> <p>It is important to acknowledge that whilst the focus has been on residential development the Council also has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet its economic requirements. The draft DPD clearly sets out a number sites that are expected to deliver employment opportunities across the Borough.</p>	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB11	<p>Object to the sites being allocated for housing and other uses. The proposals are based on WBC mitigating its extreme indebtedness by increasing council tax receipts. The proposals are at a density that is out of keeping with the surrounding area, unsustainable with the existing infrastructure and will destroy the openness of the lancape. It will also the boundary between the town and Mayford village which is one of the principles of Green Belt. It will affect house prices in the local area. 50% affordable housing requirement will result in high density development of back to back houses and high rise flats. Woking is one of the most dense boroughs in Surrey and too focused on housing building rather than creating local employment opportunities. Woking is limited for development by waterways, Green Belt and flood plains.</p>	None stated.	<p>Woking Borough Council has committed to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to enable the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 dwellings, 28,000sqm of office, 20,000sqm warehouse and 93,900sqm retail floor space between 2010 and 2027. The housing needs for the Borough are clearly set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The representation is correct that the Borough is constrained by various physical features and planning designations including the Green Belt and flood plains. As set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), the Core Strategy Examination Inspector agreed with the Council that the Green Belt should be identified as a direction of future development. The Council therefore consider the draft Site Allocations DPD to be consistent with national policy and working toward addressing the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council's approach to infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the separation between Woking and Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0. The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs.</p> <p>To clarify, the population of Woking Borough is approximately 100,000. Developments noted in the representation in Brookwood and Knaphill have sought to deliver a mix of housing types, again to meet local need. This is important to note as Woking Town Centre will predominantly provide flatted development schemes, whilst other parts of the borough are generally more suitable for family housing.</p> <p>It is important to acknowledge that whilst the focus has been on residential development the Council also has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet its economic requirements. The draft DPD clearly sets out a number sites that are expected to deliver employment</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						opportunities across the Borough.	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	The writers do not understand the status and concept of Free Schools. They are free of County Council control and SCC has no authority to approve or refuse a free school application and why the application is being determined by WBC. The funding will come from central government and WBC is making the application for the school. The fact that the report writers do not understand this throws serious doubt about the competence of the rest of the document.	None stated.	As clearly set out in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school on the site, Surrey County Council, as the education authority for the area, has confirmed that there is a need for a secondary school in the Borough to meet the future needs of local people. Although the proposed school is a Free School and will not be under SCC control, as education authority for the area, they advise Woking Borough Council on education needs and forecasts. Therefore the County Education Authority's views on the proposed school were an important element in assessing the proposed scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	Affordable housing is not defined. The average property price in Mayford is not affordable and therefore smaller houses and one bedroom flats will need to be built to keep property values affordable. The is contrary to Green Belt purposes. The proposals will not lead to sustainable development.	None stated.	<p>Affordable housing is clearly defined in the NPPF. It states that affordable housing is 'Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. More information is also provided with the Core Strategy and the Affordable Housing Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs. In combination the safeguarded sites should be integrated to prevent development taking place in isolation with little or no connectivity to existing and future services and facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	Affordable housing is not defined. The average property price in Mayford is not affordable and therefore smaller houses and one bedroom flats will need to be built to keep property values affordable. The is contrary to Green Belt purposes. The proposals will not lead to sustainable development.	None stated.	<p>Affordable housing is clearly defined in the NPPF. It states that affordable housing is 'Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. More information is also provided with the Core Strategy and the Affordable Housing Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The</p>	No further modification is 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 takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs. In combination the safeguarded sites should be integrated to prevent development taking place in isolation with little or no connectivity to existing and future services and facilities.</p>	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	Affordable housing is not defined. The average property price in Mayford is not affordable and therefore smaller houses and one bedroom flats will need to be built to keep property values affordable. The is contrary to Green Belt purposes. The proposals will not lead to sustainable development.	None stated.	<p>Affordable housing is clearly defined in the NPPF. It states that affordable housing is 'Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. More information is also provided with the Core Strategy and the Affordable Housing Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs. In combination the safeguarded sites should be integrated to prevent development taking place in isolation with little or no connectivity to existing and future services and facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	Affordable housing is not defined. The average property price in Mayford is not affordable and therefore smaller houses and one bedroom flats will need to be built to keep property values affordable. The is contrary to Green Belt purposes. The proposals will not lead to sustainable development.	None stated.	<p>Affordable housing is clearly defined in the NPPF. It states that affordable housing is 'Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. More information is also provided with the Core Strategy and the Affordable Housing Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly</p>	No further modification is 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 line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs. In combination the safeguarded sites should be integrated to prevent development taking place in isolation with little or no connectivity to existing and future services and facilities.</p>	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB11	Affordable housing is not defined. The average property price in Mayford is not affordable and therefore smaller houses and one bedroom flats will need to be built to keep property values affordable. The is contrary to Green Belt purposes. The proposals will not lead to sustainable development.	None stated.	<p>Affordable housing is clearly defined in the NPPF. It states that affordable housing is 'Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. More information is also provided with the Core Strategy and the Affordable Housing Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that affordability is a key issue and that there is a significant demand for affordable housing throughout the borough. As stated within the key requirements for the proposed allocated sites, development must be in general conformity with the suggested densities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS11: Housing Mix. The key requirements also set out design criteria for each site and are supported by robust policy and guidance (CS21: Design and the Design SPD). The policies of the Core Strategy state that development schemes must provide a range of housing types and sizes for each site and will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. Therefore the Council will expect the proposed site allocations to provide a range of housing types that are appropriate for the specific location.</p> <p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Overall the Council believe that the proposed site allocations including safeguarded sites, present the opportunity to develop a range of housing types based on local needs. In combination the safeguarded sites should be integrated to prevent development taking place in isolation with little or no connectivity to existing and future services and facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	Due to the topography of the land, there is a significant amount of surface water runoff which is absorbed by the trees along Saunders Lane. The proposals will only keep amenity trees and therefore result in increased risk of flooding. WBC will likely remove a number of trees. Any flooding to properties could result in legal proceedings against WBC.	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>The key requirements for the site note that a lancape / ecological / tree survey will be required to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features on the site as well as providing appropriate landscaping and a buffer zone. The Council also expect any development proposal to make a positive contribution toward biodiversity through the creation of green infrastructure and retention of any features of nature conservation value onsite.</p> <p>The Council has robust planning policies in place to ensure that trees are protected.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	Due to the topography of the land, there is a significant amount of surface water runoff which is absorbed by the trees along Saunders Lane. The proposals will only keep amenity trees and therefore result in increased risk of flooding. WBC will likely remove a number of trees. Any flooding to properties could result in legal proceedings against WBC.	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>The key requirements for the site note that a lancape / ecological / tree survey will be required to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features on the site as well as providing appropriate landscaping and a buffer zone. The Council also expect any development proposal to make a positive contribution toward biodiversity through the creation of green infrastructure and retention of any features of nature conservation value onsite.</p> <p>The Council has robust planning policies in place to ensure that trees are 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 representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB11	Due to the topography of the land, there is a significant amount of surface water runoff which is absorbed by the trees along Saunders Lane. The proposals will only keep amenity trees and therefore result in increased risk of flooding. WBC will likely remove a number of trees. Any flooding to properties could result in legal proceedings against WBC.	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>The key requirements for the site note that a lancape / ecological / tree survey will be required to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features on the site as well as providing appropriate landscaping and a buffer zone. The Council also expect any development proposal to make a positive contribution toward biodiversity through the creation of green infrastructure and retention of any features of nature conservation value onsite.</p> <p>The Council has robust planning policies in place to ensure that trees are protected.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	Due to the topography of the land, there is a significant amount of surface water runoff which is absorbed by the trees along Saunders Lane. The proposals will only keep amenity trees and therefore result in increased risk of flooding. WBC will likely remove a number of trees. Any flooding to properties could result in legal proceedings against WBC.	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>The key requirements for the site note that a lancape / tree survey will be required to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features on the site as well as providing appropriate landscaping and a buffer zone. The Council also expect any development proposal to make a positive contribution toward biodiversity through the creation of green infrastructure and retention of any features of nature conservation value onsite.</p> <p>The Council has robust planning policies in place to ensure that trees are protected.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	Due to the topography of the land, there is a significant amount of surface water runoff which is absorbed by the trees along Saunders Lane. The proposals will only keep amenity trees and therefore result in increased risk of flooding. WBC will likely remove a number of trees. Any flooding to properties could result in legal proceedings against WBC.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, the key requirements for the site note that a Flood Risk Management Plan will need to be submitted at the planning application stage, that all residential floor levels will need to be raised and that sustainable urban drainage systems will be required.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that a lancape assessment will be required to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features on the site, including trees, as well as retaining valuable trees to reduce visual impact and to create a buffer zone along the Hoe Stream.</p> <p>The Council has robust planning policies in place to ensure that trees are protected.</p> <p>The representation regarding housing densities has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	National policy states that the Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and that boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The proposals are contrary to national policy and recent Ministerial Statements.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and conformity with the NPPF 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	National policy states that the Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and that boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The proposals are contrary to national policy and recent Ministerial Statements.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and conformity with the NPPF 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	National policy states that the Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and that boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The proposals are contrary to national policy and recent Ministerial Statements.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and conformity with the NPPF 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	National policy states that the Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and that boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The proposals are contrary to national policy and recent Ministerial Statements.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and conformity with the NPPF 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB11	National policy states that the Green Belt prevents urban sprawl and that boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The proposals are contrary to national policy and recent Ministerial Statements.	None stated.	The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and conformity with the NPPF 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	The proposal would require raising the land to mitigate the flood risk. This would come at great expense and could increase flood risk to others. It should be made clear where this flood water will go and WBC seem to be incapable of assessing the risk or testing their proposals. The industrial uses for the site will be unsightly and environmentally unfriendly reclamation work. There is no provision in the proposal for environmental health involvement. These kind of activities attract colonies of rats which spill out into the surrounding areas, on these grounds I object.	None stated.	The representation regarding flood risk has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and Section 5.0. The representation regarding business related activities on the site has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. The site is an existing Travellers site with no reported management issues. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	The proposals are not based on local knowledge of the area and not based on evidence. The proposal is at a density greater than the surrounding area and will increase traffic locally. A number of the existing roads are narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	The proposals are not based on local knowledge of the area and not based on evidence. The proposal is at a density greater than the surrounding area and will increase traffic locally. A number of the existing roads are narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	The proposals are not based on local knowledge of the area and not based on evidence. The proposal is at a density greater than the surrounding area and will increase traffic locally. A number of the existing roads are narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	The proposals are not based on local knowledge of the area and not based on evidence. The proposal is at a density greater than the surrounding area and will increase traffic locally. A number of the existing roads are narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB11	The proposals are not based on local knowledge of the area and not based on evidence. The proposal is at a density greater than the surrounding area and will increase traffic locally. A number of the existing roads are narrow and unsuitable for additional traffic.	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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	The housing on Saunders Lane is incorrectly described in the report as Ribbon Development. Every house has a large garden and 30 dph is significantly higher than the local area. The existing character of the buildings in the area is a mixture of architectural styles. For your information ribbon development is defined as: modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	The housing on Saunders Lane is incorrectly described in the report as Ribbon Development. Every house has a large garden and 30 dph is significantly higher than the local area. The existing character of the buildings in the area is a mixture of architectural styles. For your information ribbon development is defined as: modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	The housing on Saunders Lane is incorrectly described in the report as Ribbon Development. Every house has a large garden and 30 dph is significantly higher than the local area. The existing character of the buildings in the area is a mixture of architectural styles. For your information ribbon development is defined as: modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	The housing on Saunders Lane is incorrectly described in the report as Ribbon Development. Every house has a large garden and 30 dph is significantly higher than the local area. The existing character of the buildings in the area is a mixture of architectural styles. For your information ribbon development is defined as: modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB11	The housing on Saunders Lane is incorrectly described in the report as Ribbon Development. Every house has a large garden and 30 dph is significantly higher than the local area. The existing character of the buildings in the area is a mixture of architectural styles. For your information ribbon development is defined as: modern urban sprawl of houses and industrial units spilling out along the sides of arterial roads.	None stated.	To clarify, ribbon development is defined as 'Development, usually residential, extending along one or both sides of a road but not extended in depth' (planningportal.gov.uk). Saunders Lane is therefore an example of ribbon development as it contains houses on one and in places, both sides of a road with no further development set behind it. Nevertheless, 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 housing densities 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
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services. Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit	None stated.	The infrequent bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.		<p>increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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>	of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB7	The statement that the development will be integrated into Mayford is ironical. The proposals will generate a significant amount of traffic. A shopping centre and communities facilities would not mitigate the harm done to the area. These units will remain unlet due to large retail units nearby. The village already has a village hall so why would we need any more community facilities. South Woking already has a number of leisure facilities.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floor space over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand/or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB8	The statement that the development will be integrated into Mayford is ironical. The proposals will generate a significant amount of traffic. A shopping centre and communities facilities would not mitigate the harm done to the area. These units will remain unlet due to large retail units nearby. The village already has a village hall so why would we need any more community facilities. South Woking already has a number of leisure facilities.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floor space over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand/or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB9	The statement that the development will be integrated into Mayford is ironical. The proposals will generate a significant amount of traffic. A shopping centre and communities facilities would not mitigate the harm done to the area. These units will remain unlet due to large retail units nearby. The village already has a village hall so why would we need any more community facilities. South Woking already has a number of leisure facilities.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floor space over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand/or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB10	The statement that the development will be integrated into Mayford is ironical. The proposals will generate a significant amount of traffic. A shopping centre and communities facilities would not mitigate the harm done to the area. These units will remain unlet due to large retail units nearby. The village already has a village hall so why would we need any more community facilities. South Woking already has a number of leisure facilities.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The</p>	No further modification is 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>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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egleby Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floor space over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand/or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	
1604	Royston	Simkin	GB11	The statement that the development will be integrated into Mayford is ironical. The proposals will generate a significant amount of traffic. A shopping centre and communities facilities would not mitigate the harm done to the area. These units will remain unlet due to large retail units nearby. The village already has a village hall so why would we need any more community facilities. South Woking already has a number of leisure facilities.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egle Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people as well as reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of 93,900sqm of retail floor space over the plan period. As noted in the response above, this is to meet local day to day needs as well as work toward the sustainable economic growth of the Borough. The Council economic strategy is an important element of creating a place where people can live, work and visit.</p> <p>As above, any additional community facilities would support an increased population. The existing village hall may not meet future demand/or the type of community facility required if the safeguarded sites in the area are delivered for housing.</p>	
1154	Nina	Simon	General	(None stated)	None stated.	Not applicable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	Air quality will be negatively affected by more vehicles and sitting traffic. People will not walk everywhere.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	Air quality will be negatively affected by more vehicles and sitting traffic. People will not walk everywhere.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	Air quality will be negatively affected by more vehicles and sitting traffic. People will not walk everywhere.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	Expansion of West Byfleet schools is based on meeting existing demand. Unlikely this capacity will meet the demands from more homes. Also a shortage of high school spaces.	None stated.	The overall approach to infrastructure provision, including educational provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	Expansion of West Byfleet schools is based on meeting existing demand. Unlikely this capacity will meet the demands from more homes. Also a shortage of high school spaces.	None stated.	The overall approach to infrastructure provision, including educational provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	Expansion of West Byfleet schools is based on meeting existing demand. Unlikely this capacity will meet the demands from more homes. Also a shortage of high school spaces.	None stated.	The overall approach to infrastructure provision, including educational provision to support the development is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	I feel strongly using green spaces for development will materially change the nature of West Byfleet village.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Collectively, the evidence justifies the allocations in West Byfleet. The landscape implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the character of the area will not be significantly undermined as clearly set out in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	I feel strongly using green spaces for development will materially change the nature of West Byfleet village.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Collectively, the evidence justifies the allocations in West Byfleet. The landscape implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 7 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
						Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the character of the area will not be significantly undermined as clearly set out in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	I feel strongly using green spaces for development will materially change the nature of West Byfleet village.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals are informed by a range of evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Collectively, the evidence justifies the allocations in West Byfleet. The landscape implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the character of the area will not be significantly undermined as clearly set out in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	Village infrastructure cannot support many more dwellings - schools, roads, doctors, parking are all at or near capacity.	None stated.	Infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	Village infrastructure cannot support many more dwellings - schools, roads, doctors, parking are all at or near capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The 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
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	Village infrastructure cannot support many more dwellings - schools, roads, doctors, parking are all at or near capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	I cannot understand how Parvis and Camphill Roads can support more traffic and still be usable and safe. Already concerns about expanding West Byfleet school, pupil numbers will increase to 2020.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed comprehensively 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
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	I cannot understand how Parvis and Camphill Roads can support more traffic and still be usable and safe. Already concerns about expanding West Byfleet school, pupil numbers will increase to 2020.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed comprehensively 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	I cannot understand how Parvis and Camphill Roads can support more traffic and still be usable and safe. Already concerns about expanding West Byfleet school, pupil numbers will increase to 2020.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed comprehensively 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
1154	Nina	Simon	General	Expansion of the school and these other proposals will not only increase traffic flow but also sitting traffic.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	Already difficult for drivers to safely turn out from Dartnell Park onto Parvis Road, an arterial route and bottleneck already. There are few alternative routes.	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposal will ensure that site specific requirements are fully assessed and adequate mitigation introduced as part of any proposal to come forward. The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	Already difficult for drivers to safely turn out from Dartnell Park onto Parvis Road, an arterial route and bottleneck already. There are few alternative routes.	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposal will make that detail site specific mitigation measures are appropriately assessed and adequate mitigation introduced. The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	Already difficult for drivers to safely turn out from Dartnell Park onto Parvis Road, an arterial route and bottleneck already. There are few alternative routes.	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposal will make that detail site specific mitigation measures are appropriately assessed and adequate mitigation introduced. The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	It's misleading to quote the proportion of reduction in Green Belt in Woking as a whole. Development represents almost a COMPLETE LOSS of Green Belt in West Byfleet, an unreasonably high proportion.	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints in the area, the Council has to allocate sites in sustainable locations. The sites that are being proposed are the most sustainable when compared with other reasonable alternates considered. The Council accepts that this does not ensure the even distribution of development across the Borough, and will result in about 37.8% of the Green Belt in West Byfleet being proposed for future development. Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	It's misleading to quote the proportion of reduction in Green Belt in Woking as a whole. Development represents almost a COMPLETE LOSS of Green Belt in West Byfleet, an unreasonably high proportion.	None stated.	If and when the Council had quoted the loss of Green Belt in percentage terms, it is not intended to mislead. It is only to put into context the amount of land being proposed to be released. The Council value the protection of Green Belt land. However it also has the responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The Council believes that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	It's misleading to quote the proportion of reduction in Green Belt in Woking as a whole. Development represents almost a COMPLETE LOSS of Green Belt in West Byfleet, an unreasonably high proportion.	None stated.	If and when the Council had quoted the loss of Green Belt in percentage terms, it is not intended to mislead. It is only to put into context the amount of land being proposed to be released. The Council value the protection of Green Belt land. However it also has the responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The Council believes that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB5	The A245 is already critically overloaded and could not cope with the additional traffic from these Green Belt developments in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. They would all inevitably need to make use of this arterial route.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB4	The A245 is already critically overloaded and could not cope with the additional traffic from these Green Belt developments in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. They would all inevitably need to make use of this arterial route.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1154	Nina	Simon	GB12	The A245 is already critically overloaded and could not cope with the additional traffic from these Green Belt developments in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. They would all inevitably need to make use of this arterial route.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB13	The A245 is already critically overloaded and could not cope with the additional traffic from these Green Belt developments in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. They would all inevitably need to make use of this arterial route.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	There is significant wildlife living in West Byfleet's green spaces, particularly birds. Animals will be negatively impacted by urbanisation.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	There is significant wildlife living in West Byfleet's green spaces, particularly birds. Animals will be negatively impacted by urbanisation.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	There is significant wildlife living in West Byfleet's green spaces, particularly birds. Animals will be negatively impacted by urbanisation.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB15	Increased noise pollution for residents as trees are removed, reducing absorption of motorway noise.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and Dm7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	GB16	Increased noise pollution for residents as trees are removed, reducing absorption of motorway noise.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Dm7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	of this representation
1154	Nina	Simon	UA52	Increased noise pollution for residents as trees are removed, reducing absorption of motorway noise.	None stated.	The Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contain robust policies to control pollution as a result of development. Examples are Policies DM5, DM6 and Dm7 of the Development Management Policies DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB15	If there is the option between West Hall and Broadoaks going forward, the preference would be for Broadoaks. It is a smaller proposal and is partially PDL	None stated.	Although this is noted, the Council has a significant unmet need for housing. This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9, 2.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB16	If there is the option between West Hall and Broadoaks going forward, the preference would be for Broadoaks. It is a smaller proposal and is partially PDL	None stated.	Although this is noted, the Council has a significant unmet need for housing. This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9, 2.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	Appendix Air Quality Modelling	The reduction of green spaces in West Byfleet will reduce air quality. Its location close to the M25 and continued urbanisation will increase traffic and exacerbate problems	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
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB15	Concerned that the proposed development will materially change the nature of the village of West Byfleet by the reduction of green space.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB16	Proposals would materially change the nature and character of the Village of West Byfleet	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB15	There is significant wildlife including Birds of Prey in West Byfleet. Proposals will have a negative effect or lead to the significant loss.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB16	There is significant wildlife including Birds of Prey in West Byfleet. Proposals will have a significant impact	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.	No further modification is 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>	
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB16	The addition of hundred of cars to the area will make roads unsafe.	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
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB15	The addition of hundred of cars to the area will make roads unsafe.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1238	Andrew	Simon	UA52	The addition of hundred of cars to the area will make roads unsafe.	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 minor highway requirements may be at the junction with Camphill Road and also notes that regard should be given to right of way along the southern boundary. 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
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB15	Green spaces promote healthy lifestyles. It can be used for various recreational facilities, including running, walking, cycling. The proposal would result in increased traffic and the removal of green space which would reduce air quality exasperating health problems.	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
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB15	It is poor Planning when there is little evidence early on to support the case sufficient infrastructure will be provided to meet the proposed development. Sufficient infrastructure should be in place or approved before development proposals are approved. The existing infrastructure is at capacity and is already stretched, it is hard to see how much more can be accommodated. West Byfleet cannot support more housing.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB16	It is poor Planning when there is little evidence early on to support the case sufficient infrastructure will be provided to meet the proposed development. Sufficient infrastructure should be in place or approved before development proposals are approved. The existing infrastructure is at capacity and is already stretched, it is hard to see how much more can be accommodated. West Byfleet cannot support more housing.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	UA52	It is poor Planning when there is little evidence early on to support the case sufficient infrastructure will be provided to meet the proposed development. Sufficient infrastructure should be in place or approved before development proposals are approved. The existing infrastructure is at capacity and is already stretched, it is hard to see how much more can be accommodated. West Byfleet cannot support more housing.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB15	Studies have shown green spaces and parkland have a positive effect on people's well being and happiness. Effectively, happiness is being traded in for box ticking for	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				housing provision.			
1238	Andrew	Simon	GB16	<p>Studies have shown green spaces and parkland have a positive effect on people's well being and happiness. Effectively, happiness is being traded in for box ticking for housing provision.</p> <p>Green spaces promote healthy lifestyles. It can be used for various recreational facilities, including running, walking, cycling. The proposal would result in increased traffic and the removal of green space which would reduce air quality exasperating health problems.</p> <p>Please do not make idealistic assumptions that people will walk everywhere. Most houses will have multiple car ownership</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 21.0</p> <p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes specific on site requirements in relation to potential on site pollution including noise and ground contamination. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by relevant technical studies. 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
1165	Allison	Simonis	GB12	I object. Traffic congestion has escalated over the last 30 years, I can barely get out of my road in the morning! Schools, health centres, hospitals, shops already can't cope. Expansion as proposed would be catastrophic to the environment and infra structure.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1165	Allison	Simonis	GB13	I object. Traffic congestion has escalated over the last 30 years, I can barely get out of my road in the morning! Schools, health centres, hospitals, shops already can't cope. Expansion as proposed would be catastrophic to the environment and infra structure.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1355	R.B.	Simonis	GB12	Object to 400 houses in Pyrford, the village is too small to accommodate such an increase in housing.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1355	R.B.	Simonis	GB13	Object to 400 houses in Pyrford, the village is too small to accommodate such an increase in housing.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <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
1355	R.B.	Simonis	GB12	Local services, infrastructure and utilities will not cope with the increase in population. The proposals will destroy the character of Pyrford.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10 in relation to utilities. In addition the Council will continue to consult with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.</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>With regards to concern about the character of Pyrford, this has been addressed in Section 23.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1355	R.B.	Simonis	GB13	Local services, infrastructure and utilities will not cope with the increase in population. The proposals will destroy the character of Pyrford.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 in particular 3.9 and 3.10 in relation to utilities. In addition the Council will continue to consult with utility providers during the preparation of the DPD and at the planning application stage.</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>With regards to concern about the character of Pyrford, this has been addressed in Section 23.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1356	Tom	Simonis	GB12	Object to proposal, the roads are already heavily congested. Another 400+ families will exacerbate problems and risk road safety	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1356	Tom	Simonis	GB13	Object to proposal, the roads are already heavily congested. Another 400+ families will exacerbate problems and risk road safety	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
1356	Tom	Simonis	GB12	Local infrastructure will not cope. The proposals are completely impractical.	None stated.	<p>The Council has comprehensively addressed this in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1356	Tom	Simonis	GB13	Local infrastructure will not cope. The proposals are completely impractical.	None stated.	<p>The Council has comprehensively addressed this in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
545	Lynda	Simons	UA50	There are not enough Doctors, schools, shops and parking places in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>West Byfleet District Centre is the second largest centre in the Borough. As such , Policy CS3 sets out that the centre can accommodate some further development over the plan period. This is reflected in Site UA51, which is allocated for a mixed use development including retail floorspace. The delivery of this site should meet the retail needs of local people. In addition, the key requirements for this site state that development should provide adequate and appropriate car and cycle parking, in line with the Council's Parking Standards SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
545	Lynda	Simons	UA51	There are not enough Doctors, schools, shops and parking places in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>West Byfleet District Centre is the second largest centre in the Borough. As such , Policy CS3 sets out that the centre can accommodate some further development over the plan period. This is reflected in Site UA51, which is allocated for a mixed use development including retail floorspace. The delivery of this site should meet the retail needs of local people. In addition, the key requirements for this site state that development should provide adequate and appropriate car and cycle parking, in line with the Council's Parking Standards SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
545	Lynda	Simons	UA52	There are not enough Doctors, schools, shops and parking places in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>West Byfleet District Centre is the second largest centre in the Borough. As such , Policy CS3 sets out that the centre can accommodate some further development over the plan period. This is reflected in Site UA51, which is allocated for a mixed use development including retail floorspace. The delivery of this site should meet the retail needs of local people. In addition, the key requirements for this site state that development should provide adequate and appropriate car and cycle parking, in line with the Council's Parking Standards SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
545	Lynda	Simons	GB15	There are not enough Doctors, schools, shops and parking places in West Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>West Byfleet District Centre is the second largest centre in the Borough. As such , Policy CS3 sets out that the centre can accommodate some further development over the plan period. This is reflected in Site UA51, which is allocated for a mixed use development including retail floorspace. The delivery of this site should meet the retail needs of local people. In addition, the key requirements for this site state that development should provide adequate and appropriate car and cycle parking, in line with the Council's Parking Standards SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
545	Lynda	Simons	GB16	There are not enough Doctors, schools, shops and parking places in West Byfleet.	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
						<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>West Byfleet District Centre is the second largest centre in the Borough. As such , Policy CS3 sets out that the centre can accommodate some further development over the plan period. This is reflected in Site UA51, which is allocated for a mixed use development including retail floorspace. The delivery of this site should meet the retail needs of local people. In addition, the key requirements for this site state that development should provide adequate and appropriate car and cycle parking, in line with the Council's Parking Standards SPD.</p>	
545	Lynda	Simons	UA50	STOP BUILDING MORE HOMES. There are already too many people and cars in our area.	None stated.	<p>There is a significant housing need in the Borough. The Core Strategy which was adopted in 2012, sets out that the Council will facilitate the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings between 2010 and 2027 to meet some of this housing need. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to provide homes for local residents. The Council notes the comment regarding the population increases. There is no doubt that development will increase the number of people living in some areas of the Borough. However the Council believes that this is sustainable so long as this is supported by infrastructure and services. This is set out in the Core Strategy and is also addressed in Section 1.0 and 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The representation regarding too many cars 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
545	Lynda	Simons	UA51	STOP BUILDING MORE HOMES. There are already too many people and cars in our area.	None stated.	<p>There is a significant housing need in the Borough. The Core Strategy which was adopted in 2012, sets out that the Council will facilitate the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings between 2010 and 2027 to meet some of this housing need. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to provide homes for local residents. The Council notes the comment regarding the population increases. There is no doubt that development will increase the number of people living in some areas of the Borough. However the Council believes that this is sustainable so long as this is supported by infrastructure and services. This is set out in the Core Strategy and is also addressed in Section 1.0 and 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The representation regarding too many cars has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
545	Lynda	Simons	UA52	STOP BUILDING MORE HOMES. There are already too many people and cars in our area.	None stated.	<p>There is a significant housing need in the Borough. The Core Strategy which was adopted in 2012, sets out that the Council will facilitate the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings between 2010 and 2027 to meet some of this housing need. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to provide homes for local residents. The Council notes the comment regarding the population increases. There is no doubt that development will increase the number of people living in some areas of the Borough. However the Council believes that this is sustainable so long as this is supported by infrastructure and services. This is set out in the Core Strategy and is also addressed in Section 1.0 and 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The representation regarding too many cars 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
545	Lynda	Simons	GB15	STOP BUILDING MORE HOMES. There are already too many people and cars in our area.	None stated.	<p>There is a significant housing need in the Borough. The Core Strategy which was adopted in 2012, sets out that the Council will facilitate the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings between 2010 and 2027 to meet some of this housing need. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to provide homes for local residents. The Council notes the comment regarding the population increases. There is no doubt that development will increase the number of people living in some areas of the Borough. However the Council believes that this is sustainable so long as this is supported by infrastructure 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>services. This is set out in the Core Strategy and is also addressed in Section 1.0 and 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The representation regarding too many cars 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>	
545	Lynda	Simons	GB16	STOP BUILDING MORE HOMES. There are already too many people and cars in our area.	None stated.	<p>There is a significant housing need in the Borough. The Core Strategy which was adopted in 2012, sets out that the Council will facilitate the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings between 2010 and 2027 to meet some of this housing need. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy in order to provide homes for local residents. The Council notes the comment regarding the population increases. There is no doubt that development will increase the number of people living in some areas of the Borough. However the Council believes that this is sustainable so long as this is supported by infrastructure and services. This is set out in the Core Strategy and is also addressed in Section 1.0 and 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>The representation regarding too many cars has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
304	Ken	Simpson	GB8	It is unreasonable to remove significant areas of GB land in the Mayford area. This would result in Mayford merging with Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
304	Ken	Simpson	GB11	It is unreasonable to remove significant areas of GB land in the Mayford area. This would result in Mayford merging with Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
304	Ken	Simpson	GB14	It is unreasonable to remove significant areas of GB land in the Mayford area. This would result in Mayford merging with Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
304	Ken	Simpson	General	Recommends that we need fewer people as a nation. We are reliant on imports for food and we need to be more self sustaining. More land should be used to grow food and less for housing.	None stated.	Population growth is considered to be an inevitable aspect of economic growth, notwithstanding this, the population growth of the nation is not in the Council's control. The Council's justification for the level of housing provision 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
304	Ken	Simpson	UA49	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland in this area that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland. Consider fewer people and less houses. Highlights the Hoe Valley several years ago which was very destructive	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
304	Ken	Simpson	GB5	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland in this area that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland. Consider fewer people and less houses. Highlights the Hoe Valley several years ago which was very destructive	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
304	Ken	Simpson	GB7	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland, mature trees and hedgerows on GB land that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland which could enhance new housing estates. Consider fewer people and less houses. Highlights the Hoe Valley several years ago which was very destructive	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
304	Ken	Simpson	GB8	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland, mature trees and hedgerows on GB land that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland which could enhance new housing estates. Consider fewer people and less houses.	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
304	Ken	Simpson	GB15	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland in this area that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland. Consider fewer people and less houses. Highlights the Hoe Valley several years ago which was very destructive	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						significantly undermined	
304	Ken	Simpson	GB12	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland, mature trees and hedgerows on GB land that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland which could enhance new housing estates. Consider fewer people and less houses. Highlights the Hoe Valley several years ago which was very destructive	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
304	Ken	Simpson	GB14	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland, mature trees and hedgerows on GB land that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland which could enhance new housing estates. Consider fewer people and less houses.	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
304	Ken	Simpson	GB16	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland, mature trees and hedgerows on GB land that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland which could enhance new housing estates. Consider fewer people and less houses. Highlights the Hoe Valley several years ago which was very destructive	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
304	Ken	Simpson	GB11	The UK is the least tree covered than in the rest of Europe. There is significant woodland, mature trees and hedgerows on GB land that would be destroyed as a result of new houses here. Recommend the retention of trees and woodland which could enhance new housing estates. Consider fewer people and less houses.	Retain woodland and trees when considering housing proposals	An explanation of the housing need is explained 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. 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
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB12	It is important to preserve green field areas which would be lost forever if built on	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB13	It is important to preserve green field areas which would be lost forever if built on	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB12	The proposed high density development is inappropriate and would harm the character of the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB13	The proposed high density development is inappropriate and would harm the character of the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB12	The level of proposed development will adversely affect infrastructure. Preserve GB and consider brownfield sites	Preserve GB and consider brownfield	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 9.0,11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					sites		
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB13	The level of proposed development will adversely affect infrastructure. Preserve GB and consider brownfield sites	Preserve GB and consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 9.0,11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB12	Object to proposals. Pyrford would suffer from extra pollution and gridlock. And the area will become a "rat run" if Wisley airfield development is granted.	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. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1357	P.A.	Simpson	GB13	Object to proposals. Pyrford would suffer from extra pollution and gridlock. And the area will become a "rat run" if Wisley airfield development is granted.	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. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1449	A.J.	Singleton	GB10	Objects to the proposals. Understands that release of land in the Green Belt should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. The Woking Core Strategy requires the Council to find sites the Green Belt for 550 homes in the period 2022-27, but this document goes further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes in the period 2027-40. There appears to be no robust explanation for this and therefore no exceptional circumstances to warrant 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
1449	A.J.	Singleton	GB11	Objects to the proposals. Understands that release of land in the Green Belt should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. The Woking Core Strategy requires the Council to find sites the Green Belt for 550 homes in the period 2022-27, but this document goes further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes in the period 2027-40. There appears to be no robust explanation for this and therefore no exceptional circumstances to warrant 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
1449	A.J.	Singleton	GB14	Objects to the proposals. Understands that release of land in the Green Belt should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. The Woking Core Strategy requires the Council to find sites the Green Belt for 550 homes in the period 2022-27, but this document goes further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes in the period 2027-40. There appears to be no robust explanation for this and therefore no exceptional circumstances to warrant 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1449	A.J.	Singleton	GB10	The proposed housing densities are too high for the resources and amenities available in the area. As a result the quality of life for current and potential new residents will be significantly compromised.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. 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
1449	A.J.	Singleton	GB11	The proposed housing densities are too high for the resources and amenities available in the area. As a result the quality of life for current and potential new residents will be significantly compromised.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	Raises concern about there being insufficient parking spaces in the area, for residents of the development and their visitors.	None stated.	The Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the needs of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses within local areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	Public transport use is very much overestimated when developments are designed and proposed; a marketing ploy that underestimates the intelligence of local residents. Based on the people likely to move to and stay on in these affordable houses, who will have middle to lower incomes, people will be more likely to work locally and rely on their cars. Public transport usage would be very low in this segment of the population. Higher earning professionals travelling to London would be unlikely to buy these houses, unless as starter homes, which they would then move away from as they climb the career ladder.	None stated.	It is expected that the development would attract a mix of people, as the Council promotes a mix of housing types and affordable housing (Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS12) who will use a variety of transport modes. The mix and use of different transport modes may well change over time, as it would in any residential area. However, the site's sustainable location just to the east of West Byfleet means that it benefits from good public transport links for future residents, and enables public transport to be easily accessed if desired. Points relating to traffic are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	There is severe congestion in West Byfleet and surrounding areas at peak times, with journey times taking substantially longer than they should. This poses a risk to people in emergencies.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Emergency services will have been consulted on this and also the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	It is not possible to expand the Parvis Road into a dual carriageway, as there is not enough land either side of the road. Expanding the A245 Byfleet Road is out of the question as it is outside the Borough and without expanding this section, traffic cannot flow through to the A3 etc. Infrastructure will crumble further.	None stated.	This representation 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	First build infrastructure and improve roads. Build Parvis road and A245 into dual carriage way.	First build infrastructure and improve roads. Build Parvis road and A245 into dual carriage way.	This representation 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB16	First build infrastructure and improve roads. Build Parvis road and A245 into dual carriage way.	First build infrastructure and improve roads. Build Parvis road and A245 into dual carriage way.	This representation 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB16	Would support development at Broadoaks if the plan is refined (abandoning the school) and transportation infrastructure is built before further progress.	None stated.	Support for the Broadoaks proposal is welcomed. Providing adequate infrastructure is dealt with 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	Identify other unused commercial properties and convert them to housing in Woking.	Identify other unused commercial properties and convert them to housing in Woking.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	Identify other unused commercial properties and convert them to housing in Woking.	Identify other unused commercial properties and convert them to housing in Woking.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	Together with other proposed development at Broadoaks and in Byfleet (GB4 and GB5) the impact on traffic and congestion will be devastating. Local people will be unable to get out at peak times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB16	Together with other proposed development at Broadoaks and in Byfleet (GB4 and GB5) the impact on traffic and congestion will be devastating. Local people will be unable to get out at peak times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB4	Together with other proposed development at Broadoaks and in Byfleet (GB4 and GB5) the impact on traffic and congestion will be devastating. Local people will be unable to get out at peak times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB5	Together with other proposed development at Broadoaks and in Byfleet (GB4 and GB5) the impact on traffic and congestion will be devastating. Local people will be unable to get out at peak times.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	If the Council has any interest in the local community it would first propose infrastructure development before this proposal. The Council must demonstrate a viable proposal, and show how it will eliminate the infrastructure problem. The solution is not to waste money on another expensive study, but to think sensibly about traffic and journeys to understand the consequences of the proposals.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and in terms of background evidence, Section 8.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	At the meeting the Council representative said congestion is only compared and looked at county level, and Surrey as a whole enjoys traffic that is below the unacceptable traffic index, and therefore there is no problem. There will be a considerable detrimental effect in Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford and surrounding areas.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The proposals underestimate the traffic/ additional journeys that will be created by the developments. Contends that most houses will have two cars, meaning 1200 additional cars in the area rather than the 500+ given in the consultation. Urges a common sense approach to estimating meaningful numbers rather than spending lots of money on studies that manipulate numbers.	None stated.	This representation 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The Council has disregarded evidence in a study from the 1990s which shows local infrastructure could not support any substantial housing developments. It has undertaken further studies, wasting large sums of money, to justify the proposal. Massive development at Brooklands and surrounding areas took place after the 1990s study and has led to overcrowding of local roads and infrastructure. Broadoaks was given permission before these large developments.	None stated.	A legitimate and integral part of a Local Authority's function is local plan making (more detail can be found in the National Planning Policy Framework), and this document is key part of that. The Council's broader spatial strategy for development is set out in its Core Strategy, adopted in 2012, and this document seeks to deliver its development requirements. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, in terms of the justification for releasing sites from the Green Belt for development in Sections 1.0 and 2.0 and for infrastructure, in 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	People chose to live in West Byfleet and Pyrford, and Woking, because of the green environments, open spaces and parks, that make it feel like living in the countryside but close to London and with the best transport links to London. The Council has to respect this choice.	None stated.	While this comment is noted it, the Council also has a duty to meet the development requirements outlined and agreed in its Core Strategy. Furthermore the Council intends to maintain a high quality environment for existing and new residents, by providing a high quality of design, adequate infrastructure (Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) and requirements for new green infrastructure as part of the proposed allocations. The representation is further addressed in Section 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The Council cannot build any local schools as these will choke the roads with pupils coming from outside the area, and attract further infrastructure pressure e.g. utilities, land, noise, recreation etc.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, for school places, paragraph 3.8, and regarding roads, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The damage these developments would have on the environment is irreversible. Firstly, the proposals will reduce the flood plain and increase flood risk, devaluing existing properties and causing huge financial losses.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, there is no evidence to suggest that development of the site will result in a negative impact on local property values. The Council has a number of planning policies which will ensure that development makes a positive contribution to the local area. This includes CS21 of the Core Strategy as well as best practice guidance set out in the Design SPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The amount of green space that would be lost is intolerable. The proposal will remove accessible Green Belt land, which is unacceptable. West Byfleet and Byfleet are already tightly populated, with Byfleet taking of the of share of the population and homes. The Council should shelf all proposed development in the Green Belt.	The Council should shelf all proposed development in the Green Belt.	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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	Affordable houses are aimed at working families who are likely to have both adults using the road at peak times, for work and to take children to school and other activities. This will create an excess of 1200 journeys per days, which may be an excess of 2400 journeys, which would put enormous further pressure on the already choked and crumbling Parvis Road, Brooklands Road, A245 Byfleet Road etc.	None stated.	This representation 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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The proposed development is a disgrace and disregard the views of local residents and their quality of life. It is a blow to the trust of residents in Borough Councillors.	None stated.	Local Councillors have a duty to balance protection of the interests of their constituents with the wider needs of the Borough. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The proposal ignores environmental, transport, educational, utility, medical and quality of life decline for local residents.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 21.0 and 23.0. Regarding medical services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	Concerned about the impact on local infrastructure and the lack of capacity in local schools, medical practices and hospitals, which are already overcrowded, to accommodate the additional population. These have not been addressed with an adequate plan to support future growth and infrastructure needs for 10 or 20 years, before proposing development. The Council's argument that it develops and facilitates [local infrastructure] does the minimum to satisfy requirements and focuses on a borough level. This is not somebody else's problem, and starts with this decision.	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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB16	Concerned about the impact on local infrastructure and the lack of capacity in local schools, medical practices and hospitals, which are already overcrowded, to accommodate the additional population. These have not been addressed with an adequate plan to support future growth and infrastructure needs for 10 or 20 years, before proposing development. The Council's argument that it develops and facilitates [local infrastructure] does the minimum to satisfy requirements and focuses on a borough level. This is not somebody else's problem, and starts with this decision.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB4	Concerned about the impact on local infrastructure and the lack of capacity in local schools, medical practices and hospitals, which are already overcrowded, to accommodate the additional population. These have not been addressed with an adequate plan to support future growth and infrastructure needs for 10 or 20 years, before proposing development. The Council's argument that it develops and facilitates [local infrastructure] does the minimum to satisfy requirements and focuses on a borough level. This is not somebody else's problem, and starts with this decision.	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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB5	Concerned about the impact on local infrastructure and the lack of capacity in local schools, medical practices and hospitals, which are already overcrowded, to accommodate the additional population. These have not been addressed with an adequate plan to support future growth and infrastructure needs for 10 or 20 years, before proposing development. The Council's argument that it develops and facilitates [local infrastructure] does the minimum to satisfy requirements and focuses on a borough level. This is not somebody else's problem, and starts with this decision.	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
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	The Council should abandon this proposal and concentrate elsewhere e.g. rebuilding West Byfleet town centre, and developing trendy shops and flats similar to Walton on Thames. This will eliminate the eye sore and add affordable homes to the area.	The Council should abandon this proposal and concentrate elsewhere e.g. rebuilding West Byfleet town centre, and developing trendy shops and flats similar to Walton on Thames. This will eliminate the eye sore and add affordable homes to the area.	Comment noted. However large parts of West Byfleet centre are already allocated as part of the draft Site Allocations, as sites UA50 and UA51, both for mixed use development. A much larger quantity of land is needed to meet development requirements across the Borough, as detailed in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Alternative brownfield sites are addressed in Sections 9.0 and 11.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1422	Dharma	Sivarajasingham	GB15	There is no proposal to rebuild infrastructure or create new roads to link to the A3 and M25, and improve traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1043	Dianne	Skeel	GB12	Object to development on the site. Attracted to the area because of Pyrford's semi-rural character and field which are used for leisure. These characteristics will be ruined by development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1043	Dianne	Skeel	GB13	Object to development on the site. Attracted to the area because of Pyrford's semi-rural character and field which are used for leisure. These characteristics will be ruined by development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1043	Dianne	Skeel	GB12	Additional houses on the perimeters of WTC will have a much smaller impact and change on a community compared to Pyrford. Suggests developing the area to the south of Woking on A320.	Suggests developing 400 either side of the A320 to the south of Woking.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD has taken into account a number of evidence based documents in identifying sites for development and safeguarding. This includes the Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Lancape Character Assessment. The area suggested by the representation is not considered suitable for development as it would result in substantial adverse effects on the lancape character of the area. This is due to the landscapes strong character and low capacity for change. In addition, development in this location would not be sustainable as it is beyond a reasonable walking distance to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and Woking Town Centre, and beyond walking distance of services and facilities such as doctor surgeries and schools. Development in this location would also reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford which is one of the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Nevertheless the Council has identified that land to the west of the A320 on Egley Road and surrounding areas is suitable for development needs post 2027. These are identified as GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1043	Dianne	Skeel	GB13	Additional houses on the perimeters of WTC will have a much smaller impact and change on a community compared to Pyrford. Suggests developing the area to the south of Woking on A320.	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD has taken into account a number of evidence based documents in identifying sites for development and safeguarding. This includes the Green Belt boundary review, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Lancape Character Assessment. The area suggested by the representation is not considered suitable for development as it would result in substantial adverse effects on the lancape character of the area. This is due to the landscapes strong character and low capacity for change. In addition, development in this location would not be sustainable as it is beyond a reasonable walking distance to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and Woking Town Centre, and beyond walking distance of services and facilities such as doctor surgeries and schools. Development in this location would also reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford which is one of the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Nevertheless the Council has identified that land to the west of the A320 on Egley Road and surrounding areas is suitable for development needs post 2027. These are identified as GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1043	Dianne	Skeel	GB12	The local infrastructure are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1043	Dianne	Skeel	GB13	The local infrastructure are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	Suggests developing 400 either side of the A320 to the south of Woking.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The proposed modification for 400 dwellings to the south of Woking on the A320 has been considered in the Green Belt boundary review. This area of land was considered to be important in maintaining a separation between Woking and Guildford, one of the principles of Green Belt. The Sustainability Appraisal also supports this.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1043	Dianne	Skeel	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.	
1043	Dianne	Skeel	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated, and	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on 6 July 2015.	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.		
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
554	Joyce	Skinner	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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 toward 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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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	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
				Mayford.			
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
554	Joyce	Skinner	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
554	Joyce	Skinner	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
554	Joyce	Skinner	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,	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	No further modification is 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, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.		<p>Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	
554	Joyce	Skinner	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1010	Mark	Slater	GB5	Objects to development of the Green Belt.	Leave it as it is	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1010	Mark	Slater	GB17	Objects to development of the Green Belt.	Leave it as it is	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1010	Mark	Slater	GB4	Objects to development of the Green Belt.	Leave it as it is	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1010	Mark	Slater	5	Objects.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
341	John	Small	GB10	WBC must demonstrate exceptional circumstances for the release of GB land for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy requires only 550 homes within the GB between 2022-2027.	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
341	John	Small	GB11	WBC must demonstrate exceptional circumstances for the release of GB land for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy requires only 550 homes within the GB between 2022-2027.	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
341	John	Small	GB14	WBC must demonstrate exceptional circumstances for the release of GB land for 1200 homes between 2027-2040. The Core Strategy requires only 550 homes within the GB between 2022-2027.	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
341	John	Small	GB10	The local roads will not cope with additional traffic from the proposed housing, retail park and school. They are already congested at rush hour. Without proper traffic planning the roads will experience various problems	Ensure proper traffic planning	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is 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>	
341	John	Small	GB11	<p>The local roads will not cope with additional traffic from the proposed housing, retail park and school. They are already congested at rush hour. Without proper traffic planning the roads will experience various problems</p>	Ensure proper traffic planning	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
341	John	Small	GB14	<p>The local roads will not cope with additional traffic from the proposed housing, retail park and school. They are already congested at rush hour. Without proper traffic planning the roads will experience various problems</p>	Ensure proper traffic planning	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
341	John	Small	GB10	The proposed density of 30dph on GB10 and GB11 are grossly excessive compared with the average density of 5.5 dph or less.	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
341	John	Small	GB11	The proposed density of 30dph on GB10 and GB11 are grossly excessive compared with the average density of 5.5 dph or less.	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
341	John	Small	GB10	Object to proposals at GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
341	John	Small	GB11	Object to proposals at GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
341	John	Small	GB14	Object to proposals at GB10, GB11 and GB14. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1466	John, Barbara	Small	GB12	Concerned about the proposals, and does not agree with altering the status of the land. Even if the field were brownfield sites I would not agree with building houses here. This is because of the problems that would arise with infrastructure. Local health services are already under severe strain and barely cope with current demand. Roads are also frequently gridlocked, which would be worsened by house building in Pyrford and in the surrounding area. Urges the Council to think carefully before making any decisions.	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
1466	John, Barbara	Small	GB13	Concerned about the proposals, and does not agree with altering the status of the land. Even if the field were brownfield sites I would not agree with building houses here. This is because of the problems that would arise with infrastructure. Local health services are already under severe strain and barely cope with current demand. Roads are also frequently gridlocked, which would be worsened by house building in Pyrford and in the surrounding area. Urges the Council to think carefully before making any decisions.	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
123	Nick	Smart	GB12	Development would introduce substantial additional traffic to existing country lanes and make the existing situation much worse. If the development is chosen to go ahead, build at substantially less density.	If the development is chosen to go ahead, build at substantially less density.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
123	Nick	Smart	GB13	Development would introduce substantial additional traffic to existing country lanes and make the existing situation much worse. Particularly if both sites in Pyrford are developed. If the development is chosen to go ahead, build at substantially less density.	If the development is chosen to go ahead, just develop one of the two sites GB12 and GB13 and at much less density.	Whilst the Council thinks that the proposed densities are broadly appropriate, it has always said that they are indicative and that actual densities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on the merits of individual proposals and the characteristics of the site. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB8	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford	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	No further modification is 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 is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB9	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB10	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. Policy CS6 provides a strong policy basis to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB11	Extremely concerned about detrimental impact of this development site on the environment of Mayford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB8	Development of this site would result in the loss of publicly accessible open space and also impact on the strong community feel of the area.	None stated.	Designated public open spaces are protected by policy. It is envisaged that the proposals will compromise that. 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
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB9	Development of this site would result in the loss of publicly accessible open space and also impact on the strong community feel of the area.	None stated.	The proposals will not impact on designated open spaces. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB10	Development of this site would result in the loss of publicly accessible open space and also impact on the strong community feel of the area.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. Policy CS6 provides a strong policy basis to protect the character of Mayford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB11	Development of this site would result in the loss of publicly accessible open space and also impact on the strong community feel of the area.	None stated.	The proposals will not adversely impacts on designated open space. It is not envisaged that the proposal will undermine the communities in the area. This issue is addressed in Section 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB8	Increase in noise and traffic in the local area. Would also remove Mayford off the map as it would no longer be a village.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to ensure that adequate mitigation are put in place to address the implications development on noise and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB9	Increase in noise and traffic in the local area. Would also remove Mayford off the map as it would no longer be a village.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to ensure that adequate mitigation are put in place to address the implications development on noise and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB10	Increase in noise and traffic in the local area. Would also remove Mayford off the map as it would no longer be a village.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to ensure that adequate mitigation are put in place to address the implications development on noise and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB11	Increase in noise and traffic in the local area. Would also remove Mayford off the map as it would no longer be a village.	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to ensure that adequate mitigation are put in place to address the implications development on noise and air pollution.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB8	Development in the area would place extra pressure on car parking as well as increase the risk of road traffic accidents. It would also lead to cars speeding on Saunders Lane which would be dangerous.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has adopted car parking standards and will ensure that development is served by appropriate level of parking, taking into account specific local circumstances.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB9	Development in the area would place extra pressure on car parking as well as increase the risk of road traffic accidents. It would also lead to cars speeding on Saunders Lane which would be dangerous.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has adopted car parking standards and will ensure that development is served by appropriate level of parking, taking into account specific local circumstances.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB10	Development in the area would place extra pressure on car parking as well as increase the risk of road traffic accidents. It would also lead to cars speeding on Saunders Lane which would be dangerous.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has adopted car parking standards and will ensure that development is served by appropriate level of parking, taking into account specific local circumstances.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB11	Development in the area would place extra pressure on car parking as well as increase the risk of road traffic accidents. It would also lead to cars speeding on Saunders Lane which would be dangerous.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has adopted car parking standards and will ensure that development is served by appropriate level of parking, taking into account specific local circumstances.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB8	Natural habits will be disturbed and would cause significant environmental damage.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB9	Natural habitats will be disturbed and would cause significant environmental damage.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB10	Natural habitats will be disturbed and would cause significant environmental damage.	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. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
24	Lily Rose	Smith	GB11	Natural habits will be disturbed and would cause significant environmental damage.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
24	Lily Rose	Smith	General	Should protect the Green Belt from development.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not significantly undermine the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB15	Trusts the Council will not permit development at Upshot Lane or in West Byfleet or Byfleet.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB16	Trusts the Council will not permit development at Upshot Lane or in West Byfleet or Byfleet.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB4	Trusts the Council will not permit development at Upshot Lane or in West Byfleet or Byfleet.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt for development is addressed in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Options Topic Paper. Any development would need to meet the draft allocation's key requirements and all other relevant Development Plan policies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB5	Trusts the Council will not permit development at Upshot Lane or in West Byfleet or Byfleet.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt for development is addressed in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Options Topic Paper. Any development would need to meet the draft allocation's key requirements and all other relevant Development Plan policies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB12	Objects to the proposed development of 400 houses on Upshot Lane.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB13	Objects to the proposed development of 400 houses on Upshot Lane.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB12	It is difficult to envisage the road development proposals that would allow the Council to conclude that development should be permitted.	None stated.	This representation 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
471	Christopher	Smith	GB13	It is difficult to envisage the road development proposals that would allow the Council to conclude that development should be permitted.	None stated.	This representation 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
471	Christopher	Smith	GB12	Concern is only partly driven by loss of the Green Belt other visual consequences.	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. Lancape considerations are covered in Section 7.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB13	Concern is only partly driven by loss of the Green Belt other visual consequences.	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. Lancape considerations are covered in Section 7.0 of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
471	Christopher	Smith	GB12	The greater concern is about the additional burden development will have on roads in the immediate area, including the A245 Parvis Road and across the M25, which are already congested particularly at peak periods. This would be made worse by development proposed in West Byfleet and Byfleet, and meaning that traffic constrained by M25 crossing points would increasingly find other routes to	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is 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 north or the south.			
471	Christopher	Smith	GB13	The greater concern is about the additional burden development will have on roads in the immediate area, including the A245 Parvis Road and across the M25, which are already congested particularly at peak periods. This would be made worse by development proposed in West Byfleet and Byfleet, and meaning that traffic constrained by M25 crossing points would increasingly find other routes to the north or the south.	None stated.	This representation 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
471	Christopher	Smith	General	Reminds Councillors that we live in a democracy and that they are elected to represent local people's wishes and not the dictates of central government.	None stated.	Objection noted. Councillors have a duty to balance the wishes of their constituents with wider development, including housing needs.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	Sewerage and surface water drainage - the sites lies on a south-facing slope and any sewerage effluent and surface water run-off from development will travel downhill to Saunders Lane. Developing these sites will add to surface water run-off. The current sewage drainage system is already at capacity and questions where sewage from new development will go. A new sewer will be required, alongside road widening to support extra traffic, which are not supportive of these locations being sustainable, and will not be attractive to developers.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 3.0 (paragraph 3.10) and 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	Sewerage and surface water drainage - the sites lies on a south-facing slope and any sewerage effluent and surface water run-off from development will travel downhill to Saunders Lane. Developing these sites will add to surface water run-off. The current sewage drainage system is already at capacity and questions where sewage from new development will go. A new sewer will be required, alongside road widening to support extra traffic, which are not supportive of these locations being sustainable, and will not be attractive to developers.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The GBR review is misleading in stating that there is 'local centre' within 0.7km, which only comprises a Post Office and barbers, pub, nursery and garage. A village hall and bowls club exists on part of site GB11. Future residents would need to travel to other centres to shop, and access health or dental facilities. Doctors surgeries are already oversubscribed. This further highlights the unsustainability of the sites.	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. The point about the village hall and bowls club is noted, and is acknowledged within the reasoned justification of the allocation for Site GB11. This states that these uses would not be redeveloped, but are included within the site boundary to ensure a strong defensible Green Belt boundary would later be formed along Saunders Lane. The lack of local health facilities is acknowledged, and it is accepted that there might be locally specific pressures that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
565	R	Smith	GB11	The GBR review is misleading in stating that there is 'local centre' within 0.7km, which only comprises a Post Office and barbers, pub, nursery and garage. A village hall and bowls club exists on part of site GB11. Future residents would need to travel to other centres to shop, and access health or dental facilities. Doctors surgeries are already oversubscribed. This further highlights the unsustainability of the sites.	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. The point about the village hall and bowls club is noted, and is acknowledged within the reasoned justification of the allocation for Site GB11. This states that these uses would not be redeveloped, but are included within the site boundary to ensure a strong defensible Green Belt boundary would later be formed along Saunders Lane. The lack of local health facilities is acknowledged,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						and it is accepted that there might be locally specific pressures that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
565	R	Smith	GB10	Commuters will drive or be driven to Woking station, as Worplesdon station train services are less frequent, not within easy walking distance (through woo and common and poor unlit tracks and country lanes) and the car park is already at capacity. The Green Belt review puts forward an unlikely figure that 6% of the population are scheduled to reside in Parcel 20 will either walk or cycle to work.	None stated.	This representation 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
565	R	Smith	GB11	Commuters will drive or be driven to Woking station, as Worplesdon station train services are less frequent, not within easy walking distance (through woo and common and poor unlit tracks and country lanes) and the car park is already at capacity. The Green Belt review puts forward an unlikely figure that 6% of the population are scheduled to reside in Parcel 20 will either walk or cycle to work.	None stated.	This representation 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
565	R	Smith	GB11	The site rises between 5 and 10 metres from Saunders Lane, and therefore the visual impact of new development rising up above the village will disproportionately dominate the lancape, which would cease to be rural and lose its community benefit.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, particularly paragraph 7.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The sustainability of the sites in terms of accessibility, environmental impact and community enhancement is poor (contrary to 3.5.8 of the GBR) for the following reasons: A) Roads and transport - transport is a major problem for the sustainability of these locations, especially due to possible cumulative effects from sites GB7, 8 & 9. Residents will have to use private cars to travel as there is no bus service on Saunders Lane, Smarts Heath Road or Hook Hill Lane. The nearest bus service, on Egley Road, is very slow particularly at rush hours.	None stated.	The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD as clearly set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
565	R	Smith	GB11	The sustainability of the sites in terms of accessibility, environmental impact and community enhancement is poor (contrary to 3.5.8 of the GBR) for the following reasons: A) Roads and transport - transport is a major problem for the sustainability of these locations, especially due to possible cumulative effects from sites GB7, 8 & 9. Residents will have to use private cars to travel as there is no bus service on Saunders Lane, Smarts Heath Road or Hook Hill Lane. The nearest bus service, on Egley Road, is very slow particularly at rush hours.	None stated.	The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD as clearly set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
565	R	Smith	GB8	The GBR confirms that open land in the south of the Borough performs a significant role in maintaining the separation of Woking and Guildford. The DPD shows no consideration for Mayford's special characteristics as a separate, linear footprint and rural environment, which is unique in the Borough. The Council has decided Mayford residents should cease to enjoy the village's rural benefit and be made to join Woking's urban sprawl.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been partially addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. In addition, 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 and its surrounding villages have a variety of 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 its Green Belt surroundings.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB9	The GBR confirms that open land in the south of the Borough performs a significant role in maintaining the separation of Woking and Guildford. The DPD shows no consideration for Mayford's special characteristics as a separate, linear footprint and rural environment, which is unique in the Borough. The Council has decided Mayford residents should cease to enjoy the village's rural benefit and be made to join Woking's urban sprawl.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been partially addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. In addition, 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 and its surrounding villages have a variety of 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 its Green Belt surroundings.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The GBR confirms that open land in the south of the Borough performs a significant role in maintaining the separation of Woking and Guildford. The DPD shows no consideration for Mayford's special characteristics as a separate, linear footprint and rural environment, which is unique in the Borough. The Council has decided Mayford residents should cease to enjoy the village's rural benefit and be made to join Woking's urban sprawl.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been partially addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. In addition, 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 and its surrounding villages have a variety of 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 its Green Belt surroundings.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	The GBR confirms that open land in the south of the Borough performs a significant role in maintaining the separation of Woking and Guildford. The DPD shows no consideration for Mayford's special characteristics as a separate, linear footprint and rural environment, which is unique in the Borough. The Council has decided Mayford residents should cease to enjoy the village's rural benefit and be made to join Woking's urban sprawl.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been partially addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. In addition, 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 and its surrounding villages have a variety of 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 its Green Belt surroundings.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB14	The GBR confirms that open land in the south of the Borough performs a significant role in maintaining the separation of Woking and Guildford. The DPD shows no consideration for Mayford's special characteristics as a separate, linear footprint and rural environment, which is unique in the Borough. The Council has decided Mayford residents should cease to enjoy the village's rural benefit and be made to join Woking's urban sprawl.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been partially addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. In addition, 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 and its surrounding villages have a variety of 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 its 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
						surroundings.	
565	R	Smith	GB7	Objects to the increase in the existing Traveller's community, and in this regard please refer to the response from Mayford Village Society, who I am happy 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
565	R	Smith	GB10	It is highly inappropriate for proposed development to try to gain acceptance or support if it remove benefits and sustainability from the existing environment, especially when the sustainability evidence tabled for the proposal is non-existent.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Sustainability Appraisal carried out for the DPD concludes that overall, the DPD will promote sustainable development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	It is highly inappropriate for proposed development to try to gain acceptance or support if it remove benefits and sustainability from the existing environment, especially when the sustainability evidence tabled for the proposal is non-existent.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Sustainability Appraisal carried out for the DPD concludes that overall, the DPD will promote sustainable development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	Objects to the proposal, which conflicts with the NPPF which attaches "great importance to safeguarding the Green Belt and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". This was reaffirmed in a government statement issued as recently as last March.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, in its justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding for future development needs. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	Objects to the proposal, which conflicts with the NPPF which attaches "great importance to safeguarding the Green Belt and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". This was reaffirmed in a government statement issued as recently as last March.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, in its justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding for future development needs. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB7	Objects to the removal of the sites from the Green Belt, which conflicts with the NPPF which attaches "great importance to safeguarding the Green Belt and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". This was reaffirmed in a government statement issued as recently as last March. States NPPF guidance stating that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt, and that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Mayford's Green Belt meets four of the NPPF's purposes of Green Belt: (1) it checks the unrestricted sprawl of Woking's built up areas, (2) it prevents the merging of the neighbouring towns of Woking and Guildford, (3) it safeguards the countryside from encroachment, (4) it assists in the Borough's urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land, brownfield sites, etc.	None stated.	The Council's Green Belt Review (GBR) provides an assessment of how various parcels of land contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt, as outlined in the NPPF. The approach that the GBR took is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. With regard to the principle and justification of Green Belt release, and safeguarding sites to meet future development needs, see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB8	Objects to the removal of the sites from the Green Belt, which conflicts with the NPPF which attaches "great importance to safeguarding the Green Belt and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". This was reaffirmed in a government statement issued as recently as last March. States NPPF guidance stating that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt, and that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Mayford's Green Belt meets four of the NPPF's purposes of Green Belt: (1) it checks the unrestricted sprawl of Woking's built up areas, (2) it prevents the merging of the neighbouring towns of Woking and Guildford, (3) it safeguards the countryside from encroachment, (4) it assists in the Borough's urban	None stated.	The Council's Green Belt Review (GBR) provides an assessment of how various parcels of land contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt, as outlined in the NPPF. The approach that the GBR took is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. With regard to the principle and justification of Green Belt release, and safeguarding sites to meet future development needs, see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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
				regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land, brownfield sites, etc.			
565	R	Smith	GB9	Objects to the removal of the sites from the Green Belt, which conflicts with the NPPF which attaches "great importance to safeguarding the Green Belt and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". This was reaffirmed in a government statement issued as recently as last March. States NPPF guidance stating that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt, and that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Mayford's Green Belt meets four of the NPPF's purposes of Green Belt: (1) it checks the unrestricted sprawl of Woking's built up areas, (2) it prevents the merging of the neighbouring towns of Woking and Guildford, (3) it safeguards the countryside from encroachment, (4) it assists in the Borough's urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land, brownfield sites, etc.	None stated.	The Council's Green Belt Review (GBR) provides an assessment of how various parcels of land contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt, as outlined in the NPPF. The approach that the GBR took is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. With regard to the principle and justification of Green Belt release, and safeguarding sites to meet future development needs, see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	Objects to the removal of the sites from the Green Belt, which conflicts with the NPPF which attaches "great importance to safeguarding the Green Belt and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". This was reaffirmed in a government statement issued as recently as last March. States NPPF guidance stating that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt, and that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Mayford's Green Belt meets four of the NPPF's purposes of Green Belt: (1) it checks the unrestricted sprawl of Woking's built up areas, (2) it prevents the merging of the neighbouring towns of Woking and Guildford, (3) it safeguards the countryside from encroachment, (4) it assists in the Borough's urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land, brownfield sites, etc.	None stated.	The Council's Green Belt Review (GBR) provides an assessment of how various parcels of land contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt, as outlined in the NPPF. The approach that the GBR took is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. With regard to the principle and justification of Green Belt release, and safeguarding sites to meet future development needs, see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB14	Objects to the removal of the sites from the Green Belt, which conflicts with the NPPF which attaches "great importance to safeguarding the Green Belt and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence". This was reaffirmed in a government statement issued as recently as last March. States NPPF guidance stating that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt, and that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Mayford's Green Belt meets four of the NPPF's purposes of Green Belt: (1) it checks the unrestricted sprawl of Woking's built up areas, (2) it prevents the merging of the neighbouring towns of Woking and Guildford, (3) it safeguards the countryside from encroachment, (4) it assists in the Borough's urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land, brownfield sites, etc.	None stated.	The Council's Green Belt Review (GBR) provides an assessment of how various parcels of land contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt, as outlined in the NPPF. The approach that the GBR took is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0. With regard to the principle and justification of Green Belt release, and safeguarding sites to meet future development needs, see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	While the Green Belt Review states that while sites may have low or very low suitability for removal from the Green Belt (such as Parcel 20) they have to be considered if they have high potential sustainability. However, as I will show, evidence shows nothing of the sort and illuminates the review as a desktop study lacking site specific analysis. Furthermore para 3.5.5 and 3.5.18 contradict each other due	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The methodology used is robust and has been consistently applied. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements	No further modification is 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 topography and it does not make sense to recommend removal solely on this basis.		addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome. The process and outcome are sufficiently robust, defensible and in line with all necessary advice.	
565	R	Smith	GB11	While the Green Belt Review states that while sites may have low or very low suitability for removal from the Green Belt (such as Parcel 20) they have to be considered if they have high potential sustainability. However, as I will show, evidence shows nothing of the sort and illuminates the review as a desktop study lacking site specific analysis. Furthermore para 3.5.5 and 3.5.18 contradict each other due to topography and it does not make sense to recommend removal solely on this basis.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The methodology used is robust and has been consistently applied. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome. The process and outcome are sufficiently robust, defensible and in line with all necessary advice.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	Sustainability criteria covering accessibility, environmental impact and community enhancement are stated and sites considered appropriate for development get a good 'rating by comparison' regardless of actual conditions of each site. Figure 5 of the GBR concludes that the suitability of Sites GB10 and GB11 for removal from the Green Belt is 'very low' yet Figure 9 recommends their removal! This is an unsubstantiated argument for dismembering long-established Green Belt policy.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The methodology used is robust and has been consistently applied. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome. The process and outcome are sufficiently robust, defensible and in line with all necessary advice.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	Sustainability criteria covering accessibility, environmental impact and community enhancement are stated and sites considered appropriate for development get a good 'rating by comparison' regardless of actual conditions of each site. Figure 5 of the GBR concludes that the suitability of Sites GB10 and GB11 for removal from the Green Belt is 'very low' yet Figure 9 recommends their removal! This is an unsubstantiated argument for dismembering long-established Green Belt policy.	None stated.	Peter Brett Associates published a method statement for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review prior to the review itself. The method statement is on the Council's website. The methodology used is robust and has been consistently applied. The method statement includes how various information had been sourced. The review covers all the relevant factors that needs to be taken into account to justify the release of land from the Green Belt for development. The Site Allocations DPD takes it a step further in setting out the site specific requirements to make any specific proposal acceptable. The site specific requirements addresses how detailed impacts should be assessed and overcome. The process and outcome are sufficiently robust, defensible and in line with all necessary advice.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	Development will adversely impact Mayford's environment and sustainability, including air quality, pace of life, peacefulness, wildlife and noise and light pollution.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). in terms of noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4), 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
565	R	Smith	GB11	Development will adversely impact Mayford's environment and sustainability, including air quality, pace of life, peacefulness, wildlife and noise and light pollution.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). in terms of noise and light pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4), 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	Congestion at peak hours and impacts on air quality is an issue. Accessibility is poor due to narrow, single lane roads. This is an example of actual site conditions not accounted for by the GBR desktop study. No developer will want to fund two railway bridge reconstructions and/or a new regular bus service on Saunders Lane.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) and 24.0. It is not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposals would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	Congestion at peak hours and impacts on air quality is an issue. Accessibility is poor due to narrow, single lane roads. This is an example of actual site conditions not accounted for by the GBR desktop study. No developer will want to fund two railway bridge reconstructions and/or a new regular bus service on Saunders Lane.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0 (paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) and 24.0. It is not expected that the volume of traffic generated by the proposals would substantially raise levels of air pollution. However, any development would need to comply with the relevant standards set in the Council's Core Strategy and in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016, and in national policy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	The site is a recreational space criss-crossed by several paths which have existed for over 40 years, and where long term use would probably have established Rights of Way.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site in the Site Allocations DPD sets out that Public Rights of Way must be safeguarded and existing footpaths should be retained. This would be considered in further detail at the Development Management stage. Nevertheless the Council believe that the wording of the key requirements in the DPD will ensure that the existing footpaths and rights of way are protected.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The amount of potential housing proposed is massive and disproportionate compared to the existing village footprint and housing density, disregarding NPPF guidelines. The sites comprise rising ground and development will dwarf the local environment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village. Also 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
						Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character.	
565	R	Smith	GB11	The amount of potential housing proposed is massive and disproportionate compared to the existing village footprint and housing density, disregarding NPPF guidelines. The sites comprise rising ground and development will dwarf the local environment.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 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. Also the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The proposals are based on the Green Belt Review, which is a notional desktop study and does not examine the merits and demerits of any individual site. Consequently it is both inaccurate and misleading on several key sustainability issues, especially those relating to the environmental, social and economic characteristics of Parcel 20/GB10 & 11 location.	None stated.	This matters is addressed in detail in Sections 10 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	The proposals are based on the Green Belt Review, which is a notional desktop study and does not examine the merits and demerits of any individual site. Consequently it is both inaccurate and misleading on several key sustainability issues, especially those relating to the environmental, social and economic characteristics of Parcel 20/GB10 & 11 location.	None stated.	This matters is addressed in detail in Sections 10 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The existing community will not be enhanced by increased vehicle movements that will significantly change the low level of circulation currently enjoyed by residents.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	The existing community will not be enhanced by increased vehicle movements that will significantly change the low level of circulation currently enjoyed by residents.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
565	R	Smith	GB10	The GBR excludes land relating to Special Protection Areas (including a 400m buffer) to protect endangered birds. Smarts Heath is a SSSI and recognised 'Important Bird Area' by Bird Life International. Lists an array of bird and animal species spotted on the sites, which would be wiped out by development, and adversely impacted by increased light pollution.	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
565	R	Smith	GB11	The GBR excludes land relating to Special Protection Areas (including a 400m buffer) to protect endangered birds. Smarts Heath is a SSSI and recognised 'Important Bird Area' by Bird Life International. Lists an array of bird and animal species spotted on the sites, which would be wiped out by development, and adversely impacted by increased light pollution.	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
565	R	Smith	GB10	The GBR shows no substantive evidence of the sustainability of future, disproportionate development of 500 house dumped on Mayford's Green Belt, tripling its current housing footprint and swamping its environment. Mayford possesses little infrastructure, which has hardly changed in 40 years.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough, and has led to large potential numbers of houses being proposed in certain locations. There is a need to ensure 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 Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. In terms of ensuring that adequate infrastructure is provided to support development at these sites, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	The GBR shows no substantive evidence of the sustainability of future, disproportionate development of 500 house dumped on Mayford's Green Belt, tripling its current housing footprint and swamping its environment. Mayford possesses little infrastructure, which has hardly changed in 40 years.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough, and has led to large potential numbers of houses being proposed in certain locations. There is a need to ensure 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 Mayford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. In terms of ensuring that adequate infrastructure is provided to support development at these sites, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review states that the sites have 'major environmental constraints' against development (Table 3.6).	None stated.	On balance the Peter Brett report concluded that GB8 - GB11 and GB14 should be released from the Green Belt. The DPD is informed by various evidence base studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence collectively justifies the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review states that the sites have 'major environmental constraints' against development (Table 3.6).	None stated.	On balance the Peter Brett report concluded that GB8 - GB11 and GB14 should be released from the Green Belt. The DPD is informed by various evidence base studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence collectively justifies the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
565	R	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review states that the sites have 'major environmental constraints' against development (Table 3.6).	None stated.	On balance the Peter Brett report concluded that GB8 - GB11 and GB14 should be released from the Green Belt. The DPD is informed by various evidence base studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence collectively justifies the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review states that the sites have 'major environmental constraints' against development (Table 3.6).	None stated.	On balance the Peter Brett report concluded that GB8 - GB11 and GB14 should be released from the Green Belt. The DPD is informed by various evidence base studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence collectively justifies the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB14	The Green Belt Review states that the sites have 'major environmental constraints' against development (Table 3.6).	None stated.	On balance the Peter Brett report concluded that GB8 - GB11 and GB14 should be released from the Green Belt. The DPD is informed by various evidence base studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The evidence collectively justifies the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The sites are unsustainable, which can not be overcome, hence the use of a desktop format in the GBR to engineer removal of the sites from the Green Belt.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Sustainability Appraisal carried out for the DPD concludes that overall, the DPD will promote sustainable development 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, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB11	The sites are unsustainable, which can not be overcome, hence the use of a desktop format in the GBR to engineer removal of the sites from the Green Belt.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Sustainability Appraisal carried out for the DPD concludes that overall, the DPD will promote sustainable development 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, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
565	R	Smith	GB10	The proposals, if implemented, will destroy the village community and turn the area into a built up suburb of Woking.	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
565	R	Smith	GB11	The proposals, if implemented, will destroy the village community and turn the area into a built up suburb of Woking.	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
624	Tony	Smith	GB12	WBC have ignored recommendations from the independent planning consultants they appointed.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB13	WBC have ignored recommendations from the independent planning consultants they appointed.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB12	Despite development that has already taken place, Pyrford continues as a distinct semi-rural community. 400+ new houses on these sites would substantially destroy this.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB13	Despite development that has already taken place, Pyrford continues as a distinct semi-rural community. 400+ new houses on these sites would substantially destroy this.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB12	Local infrastructure (roads, schools/nurseries, GPs, elderly car and hospitals) is inadequate and unable to cope with the additional population, both from development within the borough and in the immediate area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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
624	Tony	Smith	GB13	Local infrastructure (roads, schools/nurseries, GPs, elderly car and hospitals) is inadequate and unable to cope with the	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				additional population, both from development within the borough and in the immediate area.		that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB12	A fair number of people living in the proposed development would commute to London. Train services from both Woking and West Byfleet are already full at peak times, and given constraints on expanding services into Waterloo, it is difficult to see how substantial additional passengers could be accommodated.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>In addition the Wessex Route Plan sets out Network Rail's proposal to expand Waterloo Station over the coming years to use the formal Eurostar platforms. Again this is expected to increase capacity on the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB13	A fair number of people living in the proposed development would commute to London. Train services from both Woking and West Byfleet are already full at peak times, and given constraints on expanding services into Waterloo, it is difficult to see how substantial additional passengers could be accommodated.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>In addition the Wessex Route Plan sets out Network Rail's proposal to expand Waterloo Station over the coming years to use the formal Eurostar platforms. Again this is expected to increase capacity on the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB12	Suggests that WBC should not slavishly adhere to central government edicts, and where situations demand oppose them. States there would be sufficient support, both financial and moral, in the local community to enable this.	None stated.	The housing need in the Borough is clearly set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that the annual housing target of 292 dwellings per year is suitable, despite not meeting the Borough's housing need in full. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy as it will significantly help in meeting local housing needs. The Core Strategy, although in general conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically sets out the spatial vision for the Borough and contains a number of policies that are specific to Woking Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB13	Suggests that WBC should not slavishly adhere to central government edicts, and where situations demand oppose them. States there would be sufficient support, both financial and moral, in the local community to enable this.	None stated.	The housing need in the Borough is clearly set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 1.0), Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that the annual housing target of 292 dwellings per year is suitable, despite not meeting the Borough's housing need in full. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy as it will significantly help in meeting local housing needs. The Core Strategy, although in general conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically sets out the spatial vision for the Borough and contains a number of policies that are specific to Woking Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB12	WBC have published the DPD without reviewing valid representations	None stated.	<p>The Council published the Site Allocations DPD for public consultation in summer 2015. This consultation is referred to as the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has received a number of representations on the draft document and addressed each one in turn.</p> <p>As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB13	WBC have published the DPD without reviewing valid representations	None stated.	<p>The Council published the Site Allocations DPD for public consultation in summer 2015. This consultation is referred to as the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has received a number of representations on the draft document and addressed each one in turn.</p> <p>As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation</p>	No further modification is 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 has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	
624	Tony	Smith	GB12	The lack of capacity for additional passengers on trains is particularly galling as, due to central government inactivity, a substantial proportion of properties built on brownfield sites in London are being sold to overseas 'investors' often with fun of dubious origin, and many of whom will not occupy the properties.	None stated.	The Council notes the representation regarding the property market. Although this is an issue outside of the control of Woking Borough Council, the Council is fully committed to facilitating the delivery of housing to meet local needs. Most of the housing need in the Borough is internally generated, as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Therefore planning for future development will make a significant contribution toward housing local people as well as creating employment opportunities to reduce the need to travel into London and to create a strong local economy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
624	Tony	Smith	GB13	The lack of capacity for additional passengers on trains is particularly galling as, due to central government inactivity, a substantial proportion of properties built on brownfield sites in London are being sold to overseas 'investors' often with fun of dubious origin, and many of whom will not occupy the properties.	None stated.	The Council notes the representation regarding the property market. Although this is an issue outside of the control of Woking Borough Council, the Council is fully committed to facilitating the delivery of housing to meet local needs. Most of the housing need in the Borough is internally generated, as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Therefore planning for future development will make a significant contribution toward housing local people as well as creating employment opportunities to reduce the need to travel into London and to create a strong local economy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
645	Sara	Smith	Purpose How the Site Allocations are structured	Can we build parks and public non-agricultural green spaces into all development.	None stated.	Proposals will have to comply with Development Plan policies, including Policy CS17 which sets out the requirement to provide open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
645	Sara	Smith	Purpose How the Site Allocations are structured	Affordable housing must be prioritised. Many developments in the south of England fail to meet affordable housing targets. Hopes that Surrey does better.	None stated.	Proposals will have to comply with Development Plan policies, including Policy CS12 which sets out the requirement to provide affordable housing	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
645	Sara	Smith	Purpose How the Site Allocations are structured	Green Belts are not equal. Please protect trees and forests preferentially.	None stated.	Proposals will have to comply with other Development Plan policies, including Policy CS17 which seeks to provide and prevent the loss of green infrastructure and open space.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
703	Margaret	Smith	GB15	There is already a significant amount of traffic coming through 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 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
703	Margaret	Smith	GB15	Ensure that the wildlife is left in their natural places	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that	No further modification is 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>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>	
703	Margaret	Smith	GB15	If housing is developed at West Hall, shops and schools will need to be provided within the village to support the population increase.	If the site is developed then additional school places and shops will be required in the village.	<p>Site Allocation UA51 and Core Strategy Policy CS3 seek to encourage more retail provision within West Byfleet District Centre. This is expected to support any additional population within the local area.</p> <p>The representation regarding education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
703	Margaret	Smith	Appendix Air Quality Modelling	The existing vehicle fumes is appalling and has health implications	None stated.	<p>The sites identified in the DPD are 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 sites which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the sites are 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
703	Margaret	Smith	GB15	The proposed number of houses is too many	Less houses to be built approx. 300 to 400	The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities and amount of housing are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed number of dwellings are indicative and actual housing delivery 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 fewer dwellings as suggested (of about 300 to 400 houses) would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
703	Margaret	Smith	Consultation and next steps	When will the public be notified of the next stages of the process	Leave the land as it is	<p>The Council will publish the Site Allocations DPD for Regulation 19 consultation in September 2016. This will give the public further opportunity to review and comment on the DPD before it is submitted to the Secretary of State in preparation for Examination in Public. It is anticipated that the DPD will be adopted by the Council in December 2017.</p> <p>The proposed modification 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
828	Veronica	Smith	GB4	Byfleet has poor drainage and much of the proposed areas have flooded or are in danger of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
828	Veronica	Smith	GB5	Byfleet has poor drainage and much of the proposed areas have flooded or are in danger of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
828	Veronica	Smith	GB4	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
828	Veronica	Smith	GB5	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	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
828	Veronica	Smith	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. There is other non Green Belt land that is available and this should be used instead.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggests that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>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>A key part of the process of identifying sites for development was an assessment of sites in the existing urban area. More information about this can be found 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
828	Veronica	Smith	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. There is other non Green Belt land that is available and this should be used instead.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggests that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>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>A key part of the process of identifying sites for development was an assessment of sites in the existing urban area. More information about this can be found 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
828	Veronica	Smith	GB4	Against the destruction of the Green Belt and urge you to research more suitable alternatives.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
828	Veronica	Smith	GB5	Against the destruction of the Green Belt and urge you to research more suitable alternatives.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
828	Veronica	Smith	GB4	Object to Green Belt proposals. The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	<p>The response regarding the release of Green Belt for residential development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
828	Veronica	Smith	GB5	Object to Green Belt proposals. The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The response regarding the release of Green Belt for residential development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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
828	Veronica	Smith	GB4	The infrastructure can not cope with existing residents. A school at Broadoaks will not meet the requirements of local families.	None stated.	This representation 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. It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate Broadoaks 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
828	Veronica	Smith	GB5	The infrastructure can not cope with existing residents. A school at Broadoaks will not meet the requirements of local families.	None stated.	This representation 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. It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate Broadoaks 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
830	TD	Smith	GB4	Byfleet has poor drainage and much of the proposed areas have flooded or are in danger of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
830	TD	Smith	GB5	Byfleet has poor drainage and much of the proposed areas have flooded or are in danger of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
830	TD	Smith	GB4	The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
830	TD	Smith	GB5	The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	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
830	TD	Smith	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. There is other non Green Belt land that is available and this should be used instead.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggests that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>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>A key part of the process of identifying sites for development was an assessment of sites in the existing urban area. More information about this can be found 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
830	TD	Smith	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains. There is other non Green Belt land that is available and this should be used instead.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggests that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>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>A key part of the process of identifying sites for development was an assessment of sites in the existing urban area. More information about this can be found 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
830	TD	Smith	GB4	Against the destruction of the Green Belt and urge you to research more suitable alternatives.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
830	TD	Smith	GB5	Against the destruction of the Green Belt and urge you to research more suitable alternatives.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
830	TD	Smith	GB4	Object to Green Belt proposals. The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	<p>The response regarding the release of Green Belt for residential development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
830	TD	Smith	GB5	Object to Green Belt proposals. The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The response regarding the release of Green Belt for residential development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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
830	TD	Smith	GB4	The infrastructure can not cope with existing residents. A school at Broadoaks will not meet the requirements of local families.	None stated.	This representation 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. It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate Broadoaks 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
830	TD	Smith	GB5	The infrastructure can not cope with existing residents. A school at Broadoaks will not meet the requirements of local families.	None stated.	This representation 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. It should be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate Broadoaks 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
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	The Green Belt is sacrosanct, non-building land.	None stated.	The representation regarding Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs has been addressed 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
893	Alan	Smith	GB5	The Green Belt is sacrosanct, non-building land.	None stated.	The representation regarding Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs has been addressed 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
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	Object to the release of Green Belt land.	None stated.	The representation regarding Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs has been addressed 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
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	Object to the release of Green Belt land.	None stated.	The representation regarding Green Belt development and the need to safeguard land for future development needs has been addressed 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
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	Infrastructure to support the development will be inadequate.	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. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP	No further modification is 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>provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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>	
893	Alan	Smith	GB5	Infrastructure to support the development will be inadequate.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.</p> <p>In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	The concerns of local residents have been ignored. A petition has started.	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
893	Alan	Smith	GB5	The concerns of local residents have been ignored. A petition has started.	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
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	Many areas in Byfleet and the proposed development areas flood, development will make this worse.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
893	Alan	Smith	GB5	Many areas in Byfleet and the proposed development areas flood, development will make this worse.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	Most of the Green Belt in Byfleet will be lost. It is unfair that this area loses a much greater percentage compared to the rest of Woking.	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, West Byfleet and Pyrford are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
893	Alan	Smith	GB5	Most of the Green Belt in Byfleet will be lost. It is unfair that this area loses a much greater percentage compared to the rest of Woking.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford 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>	
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	Traffic is already bad, a new school 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; 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
893	Alan	Smith	GB4	Traffic is already bad, a new school 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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
895	Charles	Smith	GB8	Drainage and utilities infrastructure needs to be improved for additional development. Example of disruption caused by Vicarage Road closure in Kingfield.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB9	Drainage and utilities infrastructure needs to be improved for additional development. Example of disruption caused by Vicarage Road closure in Kingfield.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB10	Drainage and utilities infrastructure needs to be improved for additional development. Example of disruption caused by Vicarage Road closure in Kingfield.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB11	Drainage and utilities infrastructure needs to be improved for additional development. Example of disruption caused by Vicarage Road closure in Kingfield.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB14	Drainage and utilities infrastructure needs to be improved for additional development. Example of disruption caused by Vicarage Road closure in Kingfield.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB8	Brownfield land should be considered for development instead of Green Belt land.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB9	Brownfield land should be considered for development instead of Green Belt land.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB10	Brownfield land should be considered for development instead of Green Belt land.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB11	Brownfield land should be considered for development instead of Green Belt land.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB14	Brownfield land should be considered for development instead of Green Belt land.	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
895	Charles	Smith	GB8	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
895	Charles	Smith	GB9	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
895	Charles	Smith	GB10	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
895	Charles	Smith	GB11	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
895	Charles	Smith	GB14	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
895	Charles	Smith	GB7	Understand need for additional pitches. Site not suitable to the local area, as well as Travellers. Pitches should be provided on part of Whitmoor Common, close to the existing Hatchingtan site.	Reclaim an area of Whitmoor Common for additional pitches.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
918	Harry	Smith	GB10	Object to developing the site for housing. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
918	Harry	Smith	GB11	Object to developing the site for housing. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
918	Harry	Smith	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	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
918	Harry	Smith	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.	Please reconsider your plans	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
918	Harry	Smith	GB10	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
918	Harry	Smith	GB11	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream. Debris in the river as a result of additional occupiers or business activity would add to the likelihood of uncontrolled flooding.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding 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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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, 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
940	Margaret	Smith	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 removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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 Policy H (?) 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
940	Margaret	Smith	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 How 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.	<p>The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancap Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</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 lancap setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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 toward 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.	<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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>of Transport for Woking, the Council is 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>	
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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 removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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 removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the DPD for the reasons stated above.		
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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. 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
940	Margaret	Smith	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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
				to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.			
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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	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
				successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.			
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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 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
940	Margaret	Smith	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 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
940	Margaret	Smith	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 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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB7	Questions why several sites identified to meet future need for pitches in the Green Belt Review (Murrays Lane, W. Byfleet;	The site should be	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	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.		of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. 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 lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated. The DPD uses the term from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	the GBR of 'intensification' of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD proposal.		
940	Margaret	Smith	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 removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9 and Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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 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	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are ignored.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are ignored.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are ignored.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of lancape importance are ignored.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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	No further modification is 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.	
940	Margaret	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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 street scene.	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 4.0, in particular paragraph 4.3 and 4.8. It is important to note, the Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' 2008 guidance does recommend a maximum of 15 pitches per site to ensure a comfortable living environment and also allows for easy management. Nevertheless, the maximum of 15 pitches per site is guidance and is not a prescribed limit. The Council is aware of other Gypsy and Traveller sites in adjoining boroughs and elsewhere in the country which exceed this recommended limit, where there is no known amenity issues or management issues. Please note that Development Plan Policies, including those in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Policies will also need to be met.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
940	Margaret	Smith	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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
940	Margaret	Smith	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
984	Darren	Smith	GB8	Increased Crime	None stated.	There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed land uses for the draft allocation will result in an increase in crime. However the Core Strategy states in CS21: Design that new development should create a safe and secure environment where the opportunities for crime are minimised. At the planning application stage, the Council may also consult with the Police Service (Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDA), Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) and Architectural Liaison Officers (ALO)) to make sure that any potential crime and safety issues are addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
984	Darren	Smith	GB8	Increased Noise	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the scheme will not generate a significant amount of noise pollution that will be to the detriment of local residents or the general environment. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. Nevertheless the Council has robust policies in place that mitigate the impact of noise pollution on the environment and general amenity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
984	Darren	Smith	GB8	Increased Volume of Traffic would affect the environment	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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
984	Darren	Smith	GB8	Object to releasing Green Belt Green Belt protects countryside and wildlife for now and future generations.	None stated.	The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development needs has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
984	Darren	Smith	GB8	Pollution	None stated.	<p>New recreation space will incorporate floodlighting which will increase light pollution. However as noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
984	Darren	Smith	GB8	Wildlife protection	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 toward 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
1292	Claire	Smith	General	Requested a copy of the DPD but did not turn up.	None stated.	<p>The Council apologises for this oversight, this response was filed away with representations made on the DPD.</p> <p>It is important to note that hard copies of the documents were available at the Civic Offices and local libraries; and electronic versions were available on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1404	Les, Ann	Smith	GB12	Objects to the proposed developments. Green Belt should stay as such.	Green Belt should stay as such.	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
1404	Les, Ann	Smith	GB13	Objects to the proposed developments. Green Belt should stay as such.	Green Belt should stay as such.	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
1404	Les, Ann	Smith	GB12	There is also the matter of roads and dealing with additional traffic, and schooling needs of residents, but our foremost object is the loss of Green Belt countryside.	None 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 21.0. Sections 1.0 and 2.0 cover the justification for the release of Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding it to meet future development need beyond the plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1404	Les, Ann	Smith	GB13	There is also the matter of roads and dealing with additional traffic, and schooling needs of residents, but our foremost object is the loss of Green Belt countryside.	None 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 21.0. Sections 1.0 and 2.0 cover the justification for the release of Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding it to meet future development need beyond the plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers,	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.		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.	
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 and Section 4.0, paragraphs 4.1-4.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	· Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption and flood alleviation. Developing land will increase surface water run	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				off and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.			of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Lancape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of lancape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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	The site should be removed from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt.	the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	The site does not have the supporting infrastructure, particularly easy access to schools and local facilities (shops, medical facilities and employment) to support a Traveller site, with regard to the Core Strategy and SHLAA.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. In addition, the general approach to providing local infrastructure to support development is outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. On health services, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	Outlines the positive contribution to visual amenity, character and local environments and that sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on these set out in the Core Strategy Policies CS14, 21 and 24. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of 22 houses including two 16th century Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	The additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the Hoe stream.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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 toward 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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Green Belt by inappropriate development			
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	Outlines an extract from the Green Belt Review 2014 stating that if availability has not been established with landowners, that sites are not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use. Residents understand that Mr Lee, the owner/ occupier of Ten Acre Farm has not confirmed availability and therefore the site should be removed from the DPD.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	In accordance with national planning policy the availability of land is a significant consideration that the Council has to take into account. Footnote 11 and 12 of the NPPF is clear to emphasise that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available. This is necessary to ensure that any land that is identified for development has a realistic prospect of coming forward for the anticipated nature and type of development at the time that it is needed. As with all of the sites identified within the DPD, the Council has sought confirmation from the landowner that the site is available for development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is available and therefore has been considered within the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify sites for allocation, and the Green Belt Review sets out the order, as stated in the response. The Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) states the site and immediate surroundings could be explored for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches, and states that 'expansion' is the correct term for the DPD due to the intention of the site to be used for the current occupier's family. Objects to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification'.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0. The part of the representation objecting to the DPD's use of the term 'intensification' and suggesting 'expansion' as the correct term to use, is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.			
1444	Raymond	Smith	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
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1444	Raymond	Smith	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1152	Philip	Smitham	GB16	We have not been consulted by the Council. There is enough traffic already. Schools and doctors surgeries do not have enough capacity to cope with additional residents.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1565	R	Smyth	General	The railway car park could be used for flats with parking underneath.	The West Byfleet railway station car park should be used for flats with parking underneath.	The Council notes the suggestion for redevelopment of the West Byfleet Station Car Park for flats above car parking. This site was not previously considered by the Council. The Council has consulted with Network Rail who are the land owners for the car park at West Byfleet Station. They have not suggested that the site is available for any other uses. Until such time the Council will not allocate the site for the suggested uses as the site, in accordance with national planning policy, has to deliverable and available.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	GB12	This land is productive farm land and other non-productive land should be designated instead, such as one of the numerous golf courses in the borough.	Consider designating one of the golf courses for development rather than productive agricultural land. The Hook Heath and Hoebridge Golf Courses should be considered.	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 Green Belt boundary review assessed a number of sites within the Green Belt for development. This included existing golf courses in the Borough including Hook Heath Golf Course. This particular site was not considered suitable for release from the Green Belt due to the almost inevitable impact on mature vegetation/landscape features and potentially adversely affect the setting of the town which is well integrated in this part of the Borough. The site also performed poorly when assessed against existing local community and infrastructure facilities. Hoebridge Golf Course was also considered as part of the Green Belt boundary review. The site assessment noted that it had little or no capacity to accommodate strategic development without significant adverse landscape and visual effects.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	GB13	This land is productive farm land and other non-productive land should be designated instead, such as one of the numerous golf courses in the borough.	Consider designating one of the golf courses for development rather than productive agricultural land. The Hook Heath and Hoebridge Golf Courses should be considered.	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 Green Belt boundary review assessed a number of sites within the Green Belt for development. This included existing golf courses in the Borough including Hook Heath Golf Course. This particular site was not considered suitable for release from the Green Belt due to the almost inevitable impact on mature vegetation/landscape features and potentially adversely affect the setting of the town which is well integrated in this part of the Borough. The site also performed poorly when assessed against existing local community and infrastructure facilities. Hoebridge Golf Course was also considered as part of the Green Belt boundary review. The site assessment noted that it had little or no capacity to accommodate strategic development without significant adverse landscape and visual effects.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	General	Appreciate WBC is required to designate land outside of the flood plain for housing but more consideration should be given to the problems the proposals generate. Once these developments have been built, it will be too late to find a solution. It will be a tragedy if the Green Belt is lost forever.	None stated.	The various evidence based documents, set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD, consider the impacts of the proposed allocations on a range of issues including infrastructure, purposes of Green Belt and flooding to name a few. 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 have a significant adverse impact on the local area. The Council's response to the principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	UA51	Consideration should be given to Sheer House for flats to rent	Develop Sheer House for flats to rent	The Council has allocated this site for redevelopment as part of the draft Site Allocations DPD (site UA51). The site is currently allocated for a mixed use comprehensive redevelopment to include community uses, offices, retail and residential development. The Council has set out in the key requirements for the site that an affordable housing requirement of 40% will be required on the site. This will ensure that development will provide a wide range of dwellings that will help meet the housing needs of the area. This is supported by Core Strategy Policy CS12 and the Affordable Housing Delivery SPD. The representation regarding the tenure of properties is noted. As set out above, the Council has a clear affordable housing policy in place to make sure future development generates a housing mix to meet local needs. The Council is unable to impose a condition to limit all development to rented tenure or for them to be occupied by local people only.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	GB12	The proposed private school will result in more traffic and a new primary school is what is needed. Has the need for secondary school places been considered for the proposed	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				increase in children. Fullbrook School will not be able to cope with any additional pupils.		<p>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> <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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the educational needs of local people.</p>	
1565	R	Smyth	GB13	The proposed private school will result in more traffic and a new primary school is what is needed. Has the need for secondary school places been considered for the proposed increase in children. Fullbrook School will not be able to cope with any additional pupils.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the educational needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	GB16	The proposed private school will result in more traffic and a new primary school is what is needed. Has the need for secondary school places been considered for the proposed increase in children. Fullbrook School will not be able to cope with any additional pupils.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the educational needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	GB15	The proposed private school will result in more traffic and a new primary school is what is needed. Has the need for secondary school places been considered for the proposed increase in children. Fullbrook School will not be able to cope with any additional pupils.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the educational 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
1565	R	Smyth	GB4	The proposed private school will result in more traffic and a new primary school is what is needed. Has the need for secondary school places been considered for the proposed increase in children. Fullbrook School will not be able to cope with any additional pupils.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the educational needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	GB5	The proposed private school will result in more traffic and a new primary school is what is needed. Has the need for secondary school places been considered for the proposed increase in children. Fullbrook School will not be able to cope with any additional pupils.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <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. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the educational needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1565	R	Smyth	GB12	The proposals will result in further traffic and congestion along already busy roads. A relief road should be considered if the proposals go ahead.	A bypass should be considered to reduce congestion	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding a new bypass to see whether it is a sustainable solution to the existing and potential traffic issues. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1565	R	Smyth	GB13	The proposals will result in further traffic and congestion along already busy roads. A relief road should be considered if the proposals go ahead.	A bypass should be considered to reduce congestion	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding a new bypass to see whether it is a sustainable solution to the existing and potential traffic issues. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1565	R	Smyth	GB16	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. The proposed developments in Pyrford will add to this congestion. A relief road should be built.	A bypass should be considered to reduce congestion	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding a new bypass to see whether it is a sustainable solution to the existing and potential traffic issues. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
1565	R	Smyth	GB15	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. The proposed developments in Pyrford will add to this congestion. A relief road should be built.	A bypass should be considered to reduce congestion	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding a new bypass to see whether it is a sustainable solution to the existing and potential traffic issues. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1565	R	Smyth	GB4	The proposals will result in further traffic and congestion along already busy roads. A relief road should be considered if the proposals go ahead.	A bypass should be considered to reduce congestion	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by</p>	No further modification is 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 a new bypass to see whether it is a sustainable solution to the existing and potential traffic issues. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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>	
1565	R	Smyth	GB5	The proposals will result in further traffic and congestion along already busy roads. A relief road should be considered if the proposals go ahead.	A bypass should be considered to reduce congestion	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding a new bypass to see whether it is a sustainable solution to the existing and potential traffic issues. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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
1565	R	Smyth	GB12	Has any consideration be given to Guildford bound traffic which use a narrow lane.	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.	
1565	R	Smyth	GB13	Has any consideration be given to Guildford bound traffic which use a narrow lane.	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
1565	R	Smyth	General	Compared to other Surrey Boroughs, Woking has little available land for housing having given permission for Goldsworth Park Estate.	None stated.	<p>The Council has an adopted Core Strategy (2012), which had been informed by robust evidence. The Core Strategy makes provision for at least 292 dwellings per year until the end of the Plan period (2027). Overall about 13 years supply of land could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. The Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination agreed that the Green Belt should be identified as a potential direction for future growth to meet housing needs between 2022 and 2027. It is agreed that Woking is smaller than most Boroughs in the county and development is heavily constrained by the Green Belt. Nevertheless through preparing a Site Allocations DPD to release Green Belt for development, the Council is working within national policy and will make sure that future development will not undermine the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB12	Understand the requirement for new housing but there must be other areas that could be developed. Green Belt should be retained to be a pleasure to surrounding areas.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, paragraph 9.1.</p> <p>Overall the Council considered about 125 alternative sites as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process. It should also be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites in the existing urban area for development, ensuring that the vast majority of development takes place in the most sustainable and suitable locations.</p> <p>This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB13	Understand the requirement for new housing but there must be other areas that could be developed. Green Belt should be retained to be a pleasure to surrounding areas.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, paragraph 9.1.</p> <p>Overall the Council considered about 125 alternative sites as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process. It should also be noted that the draft Site Allocations DPD contains a number of sites in the existing urban area for development, ensuring that the vast majority of development takes place in the most sustainable and suitable locations.</p> <p>This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Removal of the Green Belt will have a negative impact on the natural lancape and views which are important to the character of the area. Pyrford is a unique village in Woking because of its heritage assets.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p> <p>The representation regarding heritage assets and conservation areas has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Removal of the Green Belt will have a negative impact on the natural lancape and views which are important to the character of the area. Pyrford is a unique village in Woking because of its heritage assets.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>In lancape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the lancape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage, in particular protecting important views.</p> <p>The representation regarding heritage assets and conservation areas has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB12	The proposed primary school redevelopment does not take into account such an increase in population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB13	The proposed primary school redevelopment does not take into account such an increase in population.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB12	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB13	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB12	Many ecological issues including water, drainage and sewage for such a significant development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1545	Jean M	Snatt	GB13	Many ecological issues including water, drainage and sewage for such a significant development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
88	James	Snelgrove	GB12	With regard to the proposed land in Pyrford (either side of Upshot Lane) being taken out of the Green Belt, I assume you will get hundreds of complaints so I will keep this to a few main bullet points outlining my major objections. I find it very surprising (suspicious even) that land which the Green Belt Review deemed as unsuitable for removal from the Green Belt, has now been included into your Site Allocation Development Plan Document. The Site Allocations seems to completely ignore expert and local advice. Other more suitable Parcels of land have been completely ignored, in particular Parcels 2,7,13 and 28. Why are you not considering Parcel 31 which was considered far more suitable than say Parcel 9.	None stated.	The Council acknowledge the distinctive character of Pyrford and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD and the collectively justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
88	James	Snelgrove	GB12	Building on GB13 and GB12 will significantly impact the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
88	James	Snelgrove	GB12	I frequently see protected animals in and around GB13 and GB12, in particular badgers and bats which will be need to be displaced.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
88	James	Snelgrove	GB12	GB13 offers unspoilt views across the valley into the surrey hills, this stunning view will be lost if buildings were placed on these sites.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a range of studies to make sure that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. Details of the evidence base are in Section 8	No further modification is 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 Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied that the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	
88	James	Snelgrove	GB12	Local schools would not cope with the increased number of children, they are already inundated with applications each year.	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
88	James	Snelgrove	GB12	There is gridlock outside the school every day at the end of Upshot Lane/Coldharbour Road. It would be a disaster to add to this congestion by increasing the number of houses on this road; 400 dwellings would add another 600 cars. I assume once reading the many objections sent to you, Woking Council will re-consider taking these important parcels of land out of the Site Allocation Development Plan and replace with sites which experts declare are far more suitable.	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
88	James	Snelgrove	GB13	With regard to the proposed land in Pyrford (either side of Upshot Lane) being taken out of the Green Belt, I assume you will get hundreds of complaints so I will keep this to a few main bullet points outlining my major objections. I find it very surprising (suspicious even) that land which the Green Belt Review deemed as unsuitable for removal from the Green Belt, has now been included into your Site Allocation Development Plan Document. The Site Allocations seems to completely ignore expert and local advice. Other more suitable Parcels of land have been completely ignored, in particular Parcels 2,7,13 and 28. Why are you not considering Parcel 31 which was considered far more suitable than say Parcel 9.	None stated.	The Council acknowledge the distinctive character of Pyrford and has the necessary robust policies to protect that. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
88	James	Snelgrove	GB13	Building on GB13 and GB12 will significantly impact the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt and it is not expected that the proposals will compromise the overall purpose of the Green Belt. It is also not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, in particular, as highlighted in Section 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic, the Council does not expect that the proposals will destroy the general character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
88	James	Snelgrove	GB13	I frequently see protected animals in and around GB13 and GB12, in particular badgers and bats which will be need to be displaced.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution	No further modification is 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 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.	
88	James	Snelgrove	GB13	GB13 offers unspoilt views across the valley into the Surrey hills, this stunning view will be lost if buildings were placed on these sites.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
88	James	Snelgrove	GB13	Local schools would not cope with the increased number of children, they are already inundated with applications each year.	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
88	James	Snelgrove	GB13	There is gridlock outside the school every day at the end of Upshot Lane/Coldharbour Road. It would be a disaster to add to this congestion by increasing the number of houses on this road; 400 dwellings would add another 600 cars. I assume once reading the many objections sent to you, Woking Council will re-consider taking these important parcels of land out of the Site Allocation Development Plan and replace with sites which experts declare are far more suitable.	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
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB12	Traffic through Pyrford is heavy and likely to cause accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB13	Traffic through Pyrford is heavy and likely to cause accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The County Council will be made aware of safety issues where these relate to delivery of the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB12	The rural, natural surroundings of the village is a main factor why many residents choose to live in Pyrford. The sites are not useless scrubland but valued for wildlife, views, walking and wellbeing, and as green, tranquil areas. The scale of proposals will change the dynamics of the village.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4), 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB13	The rural, natural surroundings of the village is a main factor why many residents choose to live in Pyrford. The sites are not useless scrubland but valued for wildlife, views, walking and wellbeing, and as green, tranquil areas. The scale of proposals will change the dynamics of the village.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM). Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 (paragraphs 7.3-7.4), 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB12	The Green Belt Review ruled out these sites as suitable for withdrawal from the Green Belt, but they are included as Site Allocations. More suitable plots are ignored. Gives the feeling of financial incentives influencing the decision.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review recommended that site GB13 should be considered for development. It is correct that the parcel of land that site GB13 is within was not recommended for development in the review. However it should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The fully evidence base is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD. Section 17.0 and 9.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets out the Council's approach in further detail.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB13	The Green Belt Review ruled out these sites as suitable for withdrawal from the Green Belt, but they are included as Site Allocations. More suitable plots are ignored. Gives the feeling of financial incentives influencing the decision.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review recommended that site GB12 should be considered for development. It is correct that the parcel of land that site GB13 is within was not recommended for development in the review. However it should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document that the Council has used in preparing the Site Allocations DPD. The fully evidence base is set out in Appendix 1 of the DPD. Section 17.0 and 9.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper sets out the Council's approach in further detail.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB12	Raises concern about the uncertainty of flooding in the village if green areas are built on.	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB13	Raises concern about the uncertainty of flooding in the village if green areas are built on.	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB12	While the government pushes Councils to find sites for more new houses, it needs to think about how to disperse the population beyond London and the Home Counties. They need to find solutions and incentives to attract people to live elsewhere. We can't all live in the same place. The Council should stand up for the community, preserve and protect the nature and environment that we all benefit from, and find more suitable land to build on, away from already overcrowded areas.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council notes the representation regarding the current national house building rational, there is clear evidence to show that there is a significant housing need in the Borough. This is set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and explained in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In order to meet some of this need, the Council successfully put forward at the Core Strategy Examination that the Green Belt could be a future direction for growth toward the end of the Plan period (post 2022). By carrying out a number of studies, including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal, the Council considers the proposed allocated sites suitable and sustainable to enable the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy. It is also considered to be consistent with National Planning Policy (NPPF).</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the existing</p>	No further modification is 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>urban area for development. Many of these sites are in the Borough's centres and the town centre in particular. Nevertheless the Council is unable to demonstrate that there is sufficient land in the existing urban area to meet the annual housing target of 292 dwellings per year.</p> <p>Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns set out in the representation, 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>	
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB13	While the government pushes Councils to find sites for more new houses, it needs to think about how to disperse the population beyond London and the Home Counties. They need to find solutions and incentives to attract people to live elsewhere. We can't all live in the same place. The Council should stand up for the community, preserve and protect the nature and environment that we all benefit from, and find more suitable land to build on, away from already overcrowded areas.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council notes the representation regarding the current national house building rational, there is clear evidence to show that there is a significant housing need in the Borough. This is set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and explained in Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In order to meet some of this need, the Council successfully put forward at the Core Strategy Examination that the Green Belt could be a future direction for growth toward the end of the Plan period (post 2022). By carrying out a number of studies, including the Green Belt boundary review and the Sustainability Appraisal, the Council considers the proposed allocated sites suitable and sustainable to enable the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy. It is also considered to be consistent with National Planning Policy (NPPF).</p> <p>It should be highlighted that the Site Allocations DPD contains over 50 sites in the existing urban area for development. Many of these sites are in the Borough's centres and the town centre in particular. Nevertheless the Council is unable to demonstrate that there is sufficient land in the existing urban area to meet the annual housing target of 292 dwellings per year.</p> <p>Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns set out in the representation, 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
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB12	Objects to the proposals for a number of reasons. We cannot consider building 400+ new homes without adapting the village accordingly and providing adequate school places. Local schools are already oversubscribed.	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
530	Charlotta	Snelgrove	GB13	Objects to the proposals for a number of reasons. We cannot consider building 400+ new homes without adapting the village accordingly and providing adequate school places. Local schools are already oversubscribed.	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1015	Richard	Snoad	GB15	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1015	Richard	Snoad	GB12	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1015	Richard	Snoad	GB13	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1015	Richard	Snoad	GB16	Supporting.	None stated.	Support is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1302	Lotte	Snowden	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) SSSI.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1302	Lotte	Snowden	General	Object	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1302	Lotte	Snowden	General	Object	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1302	Lotte	Snowden	GB9	Mayford is unique in the U.K. and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Reconsider plans	None stated.	<p>Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1302	Lotte	Snowden	GB9	<p>The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.</p> <p>There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works are planned. The roads are inadequate, narrow and with pinch points at railway bridges.</p> <p>Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern e.g. pedestrian route to Worplesdon Station.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. With regards to comments about transport see Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. With regards to comments about coalescence, see Section 12.0</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1305	John	Snowden	GB9	Object to the removal of GB land. There are no plans to upgrade the road which are already busy and dangerous.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1305	John	Snowden	General	Object	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1305	John	Snowden	General	Object	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB8	Many of the roads are narrow and contain single lane bridges, which can not handle the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB9	Many of the roads are narrow and contain single lane bridges, which can not handle the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB10	Many of the roads are narrow and contain single lane bridges, which can not handle the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB11	Many of the roads are narrow and contain single lane bridges, which can not handle the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB14	Many of the roads are narrow and contain single lane bridges, which can not handle the existing traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB7	Already have a Travellers site in the local area and do not want another in the village.	None stated.	The proposed allocation will not result in an additional Traveller site within Mayford. The allocation seeks to increase the number of pitches within the existing site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB8	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB14	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB8	The proposals would destroy the character of the village forever and should be preserved.	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
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB9	The proposals would destroy the character of the village forever and should be preserved.	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
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB10	The proposals would destroy the character of the village forever and should be preserved.	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
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB11	The proposals would destroy the character of the village forever and should be preserved.	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
1583	John, Rosemary	Solari	GB14	The proposals would destroy the character of the village forever and should be preserved.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	of this representation
55	Alan	Somers	GB12	Objection to any encroachment on Green Belt land, it should not be considered as an option. Extensive Brownfield areas are readily available. Due to the shift toward internet trading, properties on the High Street and Town Centre will become available. Soon there will be nothing but coffee and charity shops in Town Centres.	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 the capacity of the urban area, including increased densities to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development needs over the entire plan period. This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
55	Alan	Somers	GB13	Objection to any encroachment on Green Belt land, it should not be considered as an option. Extensive Brownfield areas are readily available. Due to the shift toward internet trading, properties on the High Street and Town Centre will become available. Soon there will be nothing but coffee and charity shops in Town Centres.	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
636	M	Sommers	GB8	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB9	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB10	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB11	The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	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 these 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
636	M	Sommers	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
636	M	Sommers	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on	None stated.	This representation 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
				Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.		allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
636	M	Sommers	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	This representation 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
636	M	Sommers	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	This representation 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
636	M	Sommers	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local roads. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	This representation 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
636	M	Sommers	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site 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
636	M	Sommers	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
636	M	Sommers	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB8	Objects to the proposals for housing. Outlines the malfunctioning of the housing market as probably the greatest failure in British post-war economic policy making (article from the Telegraph, 2013). Woking Borough is a victim of this failure but the proper response it not to swallow up Green Belt in one area and regurgitate it in another, particularly if that means swallowing up distinct communities. The response should be to collaborate with neighbouring authorities to solve jointly this shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.	Collaborate with neighbouring authorities to solve jointly this shared problem.	<p>The Council notes the comment regarding the housing market in the UK. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) sets out that there is a significant housing need in the Borough, of which most of it is internally generated. The Core Strategy sets out that on average 292 dwellings per year can be delivered across the Borough to meet this need, the majority of which can be delivered in the existing urban areas. Nevertheless, as agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination, around 550 homes will need to come forward within the Green Belt. The Council has followed the recommendations of the Inspector and is working toward adopting the Site Allocations DPD in order to comprehensively deliver the Core Strategy.</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> <p>The Council has and is committed to working with neighbouring authorities in addressing the strategic cross boundary issues of the area. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between neighbouring authorities as well as other consultees such as Surrey County Council.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB9	Objects to the proposals for housing. Outlines the malfunctioning of the housing market as probably the greatest failure in British post-war economic policy making (article from the Telegraph, 2013). Woking Borough is a victim of this failure but the proper response it not to swallow up Green Belt in one area and regurgitate it in another, particularly if that means swallowing up distinct communities. The response should be to collaborate with neighbouring authorities to solve jointly this shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the comment regarding the housing market in the UK. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) sets out that there is a significant housing need in the Borough, of which most of it is internally generated. The Core Strategy sets out that on average 292 dwellings per year can be delivered across the Borough to meet this need, the majority of which can be delivered in the existing urban areas. Nevertheless, as agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination, around 550 homes will need to come forward within the Green Belt. The Council has followed the recommendations of the Inspector and is working toward adopting the Site Allocations DPD in order to comprehensively deliver the Core Strategy.</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> <p>The Council has and is committed to working with neighbouring authorities in addressing the strategic cross boundary issues of the area. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between neighbouring authorities as well as other consultees such as Surrey County Council.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB10	Objects to the proposals for housing. Outlines the malfunctioning of the housing market as probably the greatest failure in British post-war economic policy making (article from the Telegraph, 2013). Woking Borough is a victim of this failure but the proper response it not to swallow up Green Belt in one area and regurgitate it in another, particularly if that means swallowing up distinct communities. The response should be to collaborate with neighbouring authorities to solve jointly this shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the comment regarding the housing market in the UK. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) sets out that there is a significant housing need in the Borough, of which most of it is internally generated. The Core Strategy sets out that on average 292 dwellings per year can be delivered across the Borough to meet this need, the majority of which can be delivered in the existing urban areas. Nevertheless, as agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination, around 550 homes will need to come forward within the Green Belt. The Council has followed the recommendations of the Inspector and is working toward adopting the Site Allocations DPD in order to comprehensively deliver the Core Strategy.</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</p>	No further modification is 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>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 has and is committed to working with neighbouring authorities in addressing the strategic cross boundary issues of the area. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between neighbouring authorities as well as other consultees such as Surrey County Council.</p>	
636	M	Sommers	GB11	<p>Objects to the proposals for housing. Outlines the malfunctioning of the housing market as probably the greatest failure in British post-war economic policy making (article from the Telegraph, 2013). Woking Borough is a victim of this failure but the proper response is not to swallow up Green Belt in one area and regurgitate it in another, particularly if that means swallowing up distinct communities. The response should be to collaborate with neighbouring authorities to solve jointly this shared problem. There is no evidence that this has been done.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the comment regarding the housing market in the UK. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) sets out that there is a significant housing need in the Borough, of which most of it is internally generated. The Core Strategy sets out that on average 292 dwellings per year can be delivered across the Borough to meet this need, the majority of which can be delivered in the existing urban areas. Nevertheless, as agreed with the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination, around 550 homes will need to come forward within the Green Belt. The Council has followed the recommendations of the Inspector and is working toward adopting the Site Allocations DPD in order to comprehensively deliver the Core Strategy.</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> <p>The Council has and is committed to working with neighbouring authorities in addressing the strategic cross boundary issues of the area. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between neighbouring authorities as well as other consultees such as Surrey County Council.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB7	<p>Objects to the proposal. 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.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0 and 9.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
636	M	Sommers	GB8	<p>Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book -maybe that now takes on new meaning. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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
636	M	Sommers	GB9	<p>Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book -maybe that now takes on new meaning. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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
636	M	Sommers	GB10	<p>Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book -maybe that now takes on new meaning. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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
636	M	Sommers	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book -maybe that now takes on new meaning. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB12	Objects to the proposals. WBC have ignored the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's two letters and their advisors attempts to address Borough Executive, and are repulsed that the Executive proceeded to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations.	None stated.	Objection noted. However, as noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB13	Objects to the proposals. WBC have ignored the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum's two letters and their advisors attempts to address Borough Executive, and are repulsed that the Executive proceeded to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations.	None stated.	Objection noted. However, as noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB12	Pyrford Primary School is about to be rebuilt to meet current demand. It will not have capacity to meet need for school and pre-school places created by the proposed developments.	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
1448	James	Southerland	GB13	Pyrford Primary School is about to be rebuilt to meet current demand. It will not have capacity to meet need for school and pre-school places created by the proposed developments.	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
1448	James	Southerland	GB12	Pyrford is unique in the borough in terms of it's charm, character, historic buildings, conservation areas and relatively unspoilt countryside. It is imperative that these assets are retained. Believes that the removal of these fiel from the Green Belt would potentially cause irreparable damage to these assets.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0. In addition, the lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB13	Pyrford is unique in the borough in terms of it's charm, character, historic buildings, conservation areas and relatively unspoilt countryside. It is imperative that these assets are retained. Believes that the removal of these fiel from the Green Belt would potentially cause irreparable damage to these assets.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0 and 19.0. In addition, the lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB12	It is unacceptable that WBC substantially departed from Peter Brett Associates recommendations on Green Belt sites in Pyrford. Unacceptable that the Council proceeded to approve the DPD when there are big questions about Pyrford issues.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1448	James	Southerland	GB13	It is unacceptable that WBC substantially departed from Peter Brett Associates recommendations on Green Belt sites in Pyrford. Unacceptable that the Council proceeded to approve the DPD when there are big questions about Pyrford issues.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB12	Unrealistic not to concede that some change and development must occur, but disagrees that the wholesale change to the village's character with 400 new homes is the solution. Please reconsider the proposals.	None stated.	The balanced nature of this comment is welcomed. The issue it raises is 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
1448	James	Southerland	GB13	Unrealistic not to concede that some change and development must occur, but disagrees that the wholesale change to the village's character with 400 new homes is the solution. Please reconsider the proposals.	None stated.	The balanced nature of this comment is welcomed. The issue it raises is 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
1448	James	Southerland	GB12	The village is a community where people want to live, largely due to its pleasant environment, safety and character and blend of facilities. Once destroyed this cannot readily be re-created.	None stated.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB13	The village is a community where people want to live, largely due to its pleasant environment, safety and character and blend of facilities. Once destroyed this cannot readily be re-created.	None stated.	The lancape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB12	Pyrford is already congested during the day and the development would unacceptably worsen that. Also not satisfied with the lack of focus on the traffic implications of development over the border in Guildford Borough, at Wisley Airfield and two other sites.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1448	James	Southerland	GB13	Pyrford is already congested during the day and the development would unacceptably worsen that. Also not satisfied with the lack of focus on the traffic implications of development over the border in Guildford Borough, at Wisley Airfield and two other sites.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB12	Understand the pressure to deliver housing from central government. Suitable downsizing apartments for elderly residents would release family housing. These would be suitable for Pyrford and would be supported if in keeping with the character of the area.	Provide elderly accommodation in Pyrford to free up family accommodation	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. The Council is committed to facilitating the delivery of the Core Strategy in full, which includes the provision of 4,964 net additional dwellings across the Borough over the Plan period. The representation regarding character has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB13	Understand the pressure to deliver housing from central government. Suitable downsizing apartments for elderly residents would release family housing. These would be suitable for Pyrford and would be supported if in keeping with the character of the area.	Provide elderly accommodation in Pyrford to free up family accommodation	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					n	<p>The Council is committed to facilitating the delivery of the Core Strategy in full, which includes the provision of 4,964 net additional dwellings across the Borough over the Plan period.</p> <p>The representation regarding character has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Parking is also difficult which is not good for the local shops. Doctors appointments are difficult to get and schools and other infrastructure will be strained too. These are concerns from the residents you serve.	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. The proposed sites in Pyrford are within walking and cycling distance of Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre and therefore should reduce the need to travel by car for day to day items.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding wider infrastructure matters such as education provision and utilities has been addressed in the Council's issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8 to 3.11.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Parking is also difficult which is not good for the local shops. Doctors appointments are difficult to get and schools and other infrastructure will be strained too. These are concerns from the residents you serve.	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
						<p>assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The proposed sites in Pyrford are within walking and cycling distance of Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre and therefore should reduce the need to travel by car for day to day items.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding wider infrastructure matters such as education provision and utilities has been addressed in the Council's issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8 to 3.11.</p>	
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB12	These plans alongside other development in the wider area will change the character of Pyrford and combined with the congestion will be key to Pyrford's future. Once these have been build on, there will be pressure to develop on more Green Belt and WBC should prevent this from happening.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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
						<p>organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council's overall approach to Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p>	
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB13	These plans alongside other development in the wider area will change the character of Pyrford and combined with the congestion will be key to Pyrford's future. Once these have been build on, there will be pressure to develop on more Green Belt and WBC should prevent this from happening.	None stated.	<p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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 overall approach to Green Belt development and safeguarding land for future development needs has been addressed 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
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB12	This is Green Belt and you are the protectors of it. The site is not recommended in the GBBR, why go against this independent advice.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB13	This is Green Belt and you are the protectors of it. The site is not recommended in the GBBR, why go against this independent advice.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
848	Elizabeth	Southern	GB4	The proposed area is liable to flooding and is the last Green Belt land in the area. The Government have stated that Green Belt should not be built on and brownfield should be used instead. WBC will therefore be in contravention with the government.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>Whilst there has been further clarification of national policy by central Government on Green Belt, there has not been any change of national policy of material significance since the Core Strategy was adopted. In this regard, it will be very difficult for the Council to have a sound Site Allocations DPD without the release of Green Belt land to meet housing land supply over the entire plan period. Without the Site Allocations DPD, there is the likelihood of uncontrolled speculative development in the Green Belt. The Council can best protect the Green Belt if it</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						can demonstrate that it has identified sufficient land to deliver its development requirements.	
934	Thomas	Southgate	General	<p>Outlines the purpose of the SA DPD.</p> <p>Outlines planning history and previous discussions with the Council and Councillors about identifying the site as a Major Development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Would like to raise the possibility of a site specific policy, potentially highlighting the suitability of allocating the headquarters as a 'major developed site in the Green Belt'. Identifying the site through a positive policy will give flexibility to allow McLaren to react quickly to changing market conditions with some certainty.</p> <p>The site is located in the Green Belt therefore every planning application has had to demonstrate very special circumstances and had to be referred to the Secretary of State. Each application has clearly demonstrated VSC and been approved, due to the nature of McLaren this will continue be the case. The current process leads to significant delays and costs. Removing this process will assist both McLaren and the Council for future developments.</p> <p>Outlines Policy CS6 criteria for M in the Green Belt. Sites can be designated M through the SA DPD without compromising the Core Strategy. McLaren's headquarters is suitable for this designation and would still be in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.</p> <p>Outlines McLaren's contribution to the delivery of the Core Strategy's strategic objectives, as follows: McLaren's headquarters is not appropriated for a town centre location however it would not compete with WT development; does not prejudice delivery of housing; the site is self-contained and cannot extend beyond current boundaries and previous applications have demonstrated VSC therefore the site would not prejudice the protection of the Green Belt integrity; McLaren is a significant local employer, contributor to local supply chain network and the site is of national economic significance; committed to world-class design; established strong working relationships with WBC and SCC, and; promotion of sustainable transport options, including a staff minibus; improvement of biodiversity.</p>	<p>McLaren wishes to raise, through this DPD consultation opportunity, once more the possibility of a site specific policy, potentially highlighting the suitability and appropriateness of allocating their headquarters site as a 'major developed site in the green belt'.</p>	<p>The McLaren site is washed over by the Green Belt.</p> <p>The GBBR excluded most of the site from further consideration for removal from the Green Belt due to the location of the site in relation to the SPA and 400m buffer to the SPA. This left the remaining area to the north which is not within the SPA or buffer, detached from the urban area of Woking.</p> <p>Nevertheless the McLaren site is based in this location and there are existing buildings on the site.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the make up of the site and the important contribution it makes to north of the Borough, the Council is of the view that it is important that any additional building development on the site should be determined on a case by case basis, where very special circumstances case should be demonstrated.</p> <p>The Council made the same case during the preparation of the Core Strategy and does not feel the circumstances have changed significantly since then, therefore the Council's position on the matter remains, and each proposal should be determined on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	<p>The site is the subject to three separate planning applications. The supporting text should make reference to application (ref: PLAN/2015/0765).</p> <p>It should be noted that the applications are for office redevelopment rather than mixed use</p>	<p>The supporting text should make reference to application (ref: PLAN/2015/0765).</p> <p>It should be noted that the applications are for office redevelopment rather than mixed use</p>	<p>The Council will make relevant amendments to the DPD to reflect the updated planning/development status of proposal sites.</p>	<p>Make changes to reflect the planning status of the site</p>
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA4	<p>Kings Court/Thomson house should be combined with a site area of 0.22ha.</p> <p>The proposed use should be mixed office and residential, with town centre uses (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/B1/D1) at ground floor to ensure a vibrant street frontage</p>	<p>Combine sites UA2 and UA4 for mixed office and residential use, with town</p>	<p>The site is proposed for mixed use development to comprise of residential and offices. This is considered reasonable given the location of the site outside of the Primary Shopping Area of the Town Centre.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					centre uses at the ground floor.		
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA2	...It should be made clear that a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking Town Centre – including the sites that are subject to Policy UA2, UA3, UA4 and UA33 – should not preclude the redevelopment of each site (or part of site) in isolation.	Recommend a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking including UA2, UA3 and UA4- however this should not preclude the redevelopment of the individual sites coming forward	<p>The proposed site allocations establish the principle of the redevelopment of the sites and set out key principles that should be met for sites to come forward. The allocation does not preclude proposal sites coming forward together should the circumstances arise.</p> <p>The Key Requirements for UA2, UA3 and UA4 require a comprehensive development brief be prepared to ensure an integrated and efficient approach to development in the area.</p> <p>The Key Requirements for UA33 and UA38 suggests that the sites could be brought forward together.</p> <p>The Council does not consider it necessary to combine the allocated sites but it will make relevant amendments to the DPD to reflect the updated planning/development status of proposal sites.</p>	Make changes to reflect the planning status of the site
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA3	...It should be made clear that a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking Town Centre – including the sites that are subject to Policy UA2, UA3, UA4 and UA33 – should not preclude the redevelopment of each site (or part of site) in isolation.	Recommend a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking including UA2, UA3 and UA4- however this should not preclude the redevelopment of the individual sites coming forward	<p>The proposed site allocations establish the principle of the redevelopment of the sites and set out key principles that should be met for sites to come forward. The allocation does not preclude proposal sites coming forward together should the circumstances arise.</p> <p>The Key Requirements for UA2, UA3 and UA4 require a comprehensive development brief be prepared to ensure an integrated and efficient approach to development in the area.</p> <p>The Key Requirements for UA33 and UA38 suggests that the sites could be brought forward together.</p> <p>The Council does not consider it necessary to combine the allocated sites but it will make relevant amendments to the DPD to reflect the updated planning/development status of proposal sites.</p>	Make changes to reflect the planning status of the site
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	Redevelopment of the site for mixed use office and residential (250dpha) is unlikely/unrealistic to yield family housing (2+bedrooms). Consider deleting reference to family accommodation.	Consider deleting reference to family accommodation	The Key Requirements are in line with Core Strategy policies. It will be the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate how proposals comply or not to the policies.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	...It should be made clear that a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking Town Centre – including the sites that are subject to Policy UA2, UA3, UA4 and UA33 – should not preclude the redevelopment of each site (or part of site) in isolation.	Recommend a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking including UA2, UA3 and UA4- however this should not preclude the redevelopment of the individual sites coming forward	<p>The Key Requirements for UA2, UA3 and UA4 require a comprehensive development brief be prepared to ensure an integrated and efficient approach to development in the area. Provided a comprehensive development brief is prepared then this will not preclude sites coming forward individually.</p> <p>The Key Requirements for UA33 and UA38 suggests that the sites could be brought forward together, however this does not preclude the sites coming forward individually.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA2	Attention is drawn to a current application for comprising Kings Court and Thomson House for mixed use redevelopment. Trizancia House, Woodsted House (both now demolished) and Chester House (Policy UA3) are currently subject to a separate outline	Thomson House should be deleted from UA2 and	<p>The proposed site allocations establish the principle of the redevelopment of the sites and set out key principles that should be met for sites to come forward. The allocation does not preclude proposal sites coming forward together should the circumstances arise.</p> <p>The Key Requirements for UA2, UA3 and UA4 require a comprehensive development brief be prepared to ensure an integrated and efficient approach to development in the area.</p>	Make changes to reflect the planning status of the site

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				planning application – ref: PLAN/2014/0759 – for mixed office, residential, restaurant and leisure uses. Therefore Thomson House should be deleted from Policy UA2 and added to Policy UA4, and the red line adjusted accordingly.	added to UA4. The combined site for UA2 should then be 0.14 hectare (Trizancia House/Woodstead House)	The Key Requirements for UA33 and UA38 suggests that the sites could be brought forward together. The Council does not consider it necessary to combine the allocated sites but it will make relevant amendments to the DPD to reflect the updated planning/development status of proposal sites.	
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA3	Attention is drawn to a current application for comprising Kings Court and Thomson House for mixed use redevelopment. Trizancia House, Woodstead House (both now demolished) and Chester House (Policy UA3) are currently subject to a separate outline planning application – ref: PLAN/2014/0759 Therefore Thomson House should be deleted from Policy UA2 and added to Policy UA4, and the red line adjusted accordingly. Chester House remains in active office use and should be retained as a separate policy in the DPD	Chester House remains in active office use and should be retained as a separate policy in the DPD	The proposed site allocations establish the principle of the redevelopment of the sites and set out key principles that should be met for sites to come forward. The allocation does not preclude proposal sites coming forward together should the circumstances arise. The Key Requirements for UA2, UA3 and UA4 require a comprehensive development brief be prepared to ensure an integrated and efficient approach to development in the area. The Key Requirements for UA33 and UA38 suggests that the sites could be brought forward together. The Council does not consider it necessary to combine the allocated sites but it will make relevant amendments to the DPD to reflect the updated planning/development status of proposal sites.	Make changes to reflect the planning status of the site
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA4	Attention is drawn to an extant planning permission for Kings Court for mixed use residential and office use and a current application for a larger site comprising Kings Court and Thomson House for the same uses. The combined site area for the combined sites are 0.22ha. Therefore Thomson House should be deleted from Policy UA2 and added to Policy UA4, and the red line adjusted accordingly. ...It should be made clear that a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking Town Centre – including the sites that are subject to Policy UA2, UA3, UA4 and UA33 – should not preclude the redevelopment of each site (or part of site) in isolation.	Amend boundaries on UA2 and UA4 (deleting Thomson House from UA2 and adding to UA4) Recommend a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking including UA2, UA3 and UA4- however this should not preclude the redevelopment of the individual sites coming forward	The proposed site allocations establish the principle of the redevelopment of the sites and set out key principles that should be met for sites to come forward. The allocation does not preclude proposal sites coming forward together should the circumstances arise. The Key Requirements for UA2, UA3 and UA4 require a comprehensive development brief be prepared to ensure an integrated and efficient approach to development in the area. The Key Requirements for UA33 and UA38 suggests that the sites could be brought forward together.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	The criterion 'exceptional design quality' is subjective and not necessary given other references to 'high design quality, public realm improvements and enhancement. Delete reference	Delete criterion 'exceptional design quality'	The point is noted, there appears to be repetition here. Delete the key requirement 'buildings should be of exceptional design quality'	Delete the key requirement 'buildings should be of exceptional design quality'
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA4	The estimated capacity of the combined site should reflect planning application PLAN/2014/1263 for 28 dwellings and 6720 sqm net (9264 sqm gross) office floorspace	The estimated capacity of the combined site should reflect planning application PLAN/2014/1263 for 28 dwellings and 6720 sqm net (9264 sqm	The Council will make relevant amendments to the DPD to reflect the updated planning/development status of proposal sites.	Make changes to reflect the planning status of the site

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					gross) office floorspace		
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA4	Suggests the policy be structured into suitable headings so that it is easier to understand and removes the risk of duplication e.g. headings Design. Transport. Drainage & Flood Risk. Sustainability. Etc.	Recommends structuring the policy into suitable headings	The Council accepts that there should be consistency in the presentation of proposals. Consequently, the Council will consider presenting all the policies with suitable subheadings and wording. This will be done as editorial amendments to the DPD .	Editorial amendments including consistent subheadings and wording for proposals
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	Suggests the policy be structured into suitable headings so that it is easier to understand and removes the risk of duplication e.g. headings Design. Transport. Drainage & Flood Risk. Sustainability. Etc. (notes duplication in existing policy proposal)	Recommends structuring the policy into suitable headings	The Council accepts that there should be consistency in the presentation of proposals. Consequently, the Council will consider presenting all the policies with suitable subheadings and wording. This will be done as editorial amendments to the DPD .	Editorial amendments including consistent subheadings and wording for proposals
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA2	Suggests the policy be structured into suitable headings so that it is easier to understand and removes the risk of duplication e.g. headings Design. Transport. Drainage & Flood Risk. Sustainability. Etc.	Recommends structuring the policy into suitable headings	The Council accepts that there should be consistency in the presentation of proposals. Consequently, the Council will consider presenting all the policies with suitable subheadings and wording. This will be done as editorial amendments to the DPD .	Editorial amendments including consistent subheadings and wording for proposals
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA3	Suggests the policy be structured into suitable headings so that it is easier to understand and removes the risk of duplication e.g. headings Design. Transport. Drainage & Flood Risk. Sustainability. Etc.	Recommends structuring the policy into suitable headings	The Council accepts that there should be consistency in the presentation of proposals. Consequently, the Council will consider presenting all the policies with suitable subheadings and wording. This will be done as editorial amendments to the DPD .	Editorial amendments including consistent subheadings and wording for proposals
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA4	Recommends references to affordable housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	Recommends references to affordable housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	The Council will make reference to relevant Core Strategy policies where it is appropriate. It is not considered necessarily to repeat extensive parts of text from other policies, as this would make proposals needlessly lengthy. With regards to Vacant Building Credit, following a High Court judgement the national planning practice guidance on Affordable Housing contributions has changed. The Vacant Building Credit will no longer apply	Provide policy links/signpost proposals to relevant policies
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA2	Recommends references to affordable housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	Recommends references to affordable housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	The Council will make reference to relevant Core Strategy policies where it is appropriate. It is not considered necessarily to repeat extensive parts of text from other policies, as this would make proposals needlessly lengthy. With regards to Vacant Building Credit, following a High Court judgement the national planning practice guidance on Affordable Housing contributions has changed. The Vacant Building Credit will no longer apply	Provide policy links/signpost proposals to relevant policies
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA3	Recommends references to affordable housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in	Recommends references to affordable	The Council will make reference to relevant Core Strategy policies where it is appropriate. It is not considered necessarily to repeat extensive parts of text from other policies, as this would make proposals needlessly lengthy.	Provide policy links/signpost proposals to relevant

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	With regards to Vacant Building Credit, following a High Court judgement the national planning practice guidance on Affordable Housing contributions has changed. The Vacant Building Credit will no longer apply	policies
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	Recommends references to affordable housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	Recommends references to affordable housing and CIL should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.	The Council will make reference to relevant Core Strategy policies where it is appropriate. It is not considered necessarily to repeat extensive parts of text from other policies, as this would make proposals needlessly lengthy. With regards to Vacant Building Credit, following a High Court judgement the national planning practice guidance on Affordable Housing contributions has changed. The Vacant Building Credit will no longer apply	Provide policy links/signpost proposals to relevant policies
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA4	Deleted reference to the sites impact on the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area. The site is separated from the Canal by Victoria Way and has no direct impact	Delete reference to the sites impact on Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area, it is not relevant	The comment is noted, given the distance of the Conservation and the severance created from Victoria Way it is unlikely that the redevelopment of this site would have a negative impact on the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.	Delete reference to the potential impact on Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA2	Deleted reference to the sites impact on the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area. The site is separated from the Canal by Victoria Way and has no direct impact	Delete reference to the sites impact on Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area, it is not relevant	The comment is noted, given the distance of the Conservation and the severance created from Victoria Way it is unlikely that the redevelopment of this site would have a negative impact on the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.	Delete reference to the potential impact on Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA3	Deleted reference to the sites impact on the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area. The site is separated from the Canal by Victoria Way and has no direct impact	Delete reference to the sites impact on Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area, it is not relevant	The comment is noted, given the distance of the Conservation and the severance created from Victoria Way it is unlikely that the redevelopment of this site would have a negative impact on the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.	Delete reference to the potential impact on Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA4	Reference to railway noise should be deleted. The site is not in direct vicinity of the railway	Delete reference to	Reference to proximity to the railway line and potential noise will be removed. However the requirement to consider the impacts on noise from the adjacent roads will remain.	Delete reference to the potential noise impact

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					railway noise, it is not relevant		from the railway line
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA2	Reference to railway noise should be deleted. The site is not in direct vicinity of the railway	Delete reference to railway noise, it is not relevant	Reference to proximity to the railway line and potential noise will be removed. However the requirement to consider the impacts on noise from the adjacent roads will remain.	Delete reference to the potential noise impact from the railway line
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA3	Reference to railway noise should be deleted. The site is not in direct vicinity of the railway	Delete reference to railway noise, it is not relevant	Reference to proximity to the railway line and potential noise will be removed. However the requirement to consider the impacts on noise from the adjacent roads will remain.	Delete reference to the potential noise impact from the railway line
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	Reference to railway noise should be deleted. The site is not in direct vicinity of the railway	Delete reference to railway noise, it is not relevant	Reference to proximity to the railway line and potential noise will be removed. However the requirement to consider the impacts on noise from the adjacent roads will remain.	Delete reference to the potential noise impact from the railway line
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA33	The redevelopment of UA33 and UA38 will have to address different environments/issues and there has been no evidence to suggest that sites will come forward together. The cross reference between the two sites are unnecessary and unhelpful	Delete the cross reference between sites UA33 and UA38	The proposed site allocations establish the principle of the redevelopment of the sites and set out key principles that should be met for sites to come forward. The allocation does not preclude proposal sites coming forward together or separately.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
383	Ian	Sowerby	UA38	The redevelopment of UA33 and UA38 will have to address different environments/issues and there has been no evidence to suggest that sites will come forward together. The cross reference between the two sites are unnecessary and unhelpful	Delete the cross reference between sites UA33 and UA38	The proposed site allocations establish the principle of the redevelopment of the sites and set out key principles that should be met for sites to come forward. The allocation does not preclude proposal sites coming forward together or separately.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
763	John and Shirley	Sparling	GB8	A school would be appropriate development but the leisure centre and running track is over development of the site and therefore objects. Woking Park is already close to the site.	None stated.	The case for releasing Green Belt land for development is set out in Section 1.0. The Council believe that the case for releasing Green Belt land to meet future development needs has already (or can be) been established and is consistent with national policy. The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
763	John and Shirley	Sparling	GB8	Concerns based on the extra traffic generated combined with the existing infrastructure. The development would also generate extra noise.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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 the site note that a Noise Impact Assessment would be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise or that generate noise provide mitigation measures to protect residential amenity.</p>	
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	The Council approved the draft Site Allocations DPD without taking into account representations received by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. The Executive felt the DPD was "based on robust evidence". The LDA Design letter stated to the contrary.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the Neighbourhood Forum and/or LDA. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is addressed comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	The Council approved the draft Site Allocations DPD without taking into account representations received by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. The Executive felt the DPD was "based on robust evidence". The LDA Design letter stated to the contrary.	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of the Neighbourhood Forum and/or the LDA. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is addressed comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	Upshot lane and B367 already busy with through traffic (to A3), known accident cluster. Access to the site would be problematic. Natural beauty of the area would be ruined by removal of trees and hedgerow to improve this, spoiling views and losing natural wildlife habitat. A roundabout would need to be large, to detriment of the village. There is no footpath. Vehicles speed. The area is also of archaeological importance.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	Upshot lane and B367 already busy with through traffic (to A3), known accident cluster. Access to the site would be problematic. Natural beauty of the area would be ruined by removal of trees and hedgerow to improve this, spoiling views and losing natural wildlife habitat. A roundabout would need to be large, to detriment of the village. There is no footpath. Vehicles speed. The area is also of archaeological importance.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB15	Both projects access onto Parvis Road. The last major traffic study for this A245 was in 2002. Surrey County Council advised the A245 was 'over trafficked' and 'burdensome' to local communities. Woking Borough Council's 2015 Transport Assessment confirms flows regularly exceed the measure used for congestion but it can take more traffic. The Royal Institute of Planning estimates an increase of movements of 10-15% per annum for development of this scale. The Council is turning a blind eye to the problem.	None stated.	The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their	No further modification is 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 are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB16	<p>Both projects access onto Parvis Road. The last major traffic study for this A245 was in 2002. Surrey County Council advised the A245 was 'over trafficked' and 'burdensome' to local communities. Woking Borough Council's 2015 Transport Assessment confirms flows regularly exceed the measure used for congestion but it can take more traffic. The Royal Institute of Planning estimates an increase of movements of 10-15% per annum for development of this scale.</p> <p>The Council is turning a blind eye to the problem.</p>	None stated.	<p>The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	<p>The DPD is in part based on the Green Belt Review, which is flawed. Particularly GB12 and GB13 which consistently assessed as unsuitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes (poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity). Much of the Green Belt Review evidence undermines the case for its subsequent inclusion. GB13 was considered particularly sensitive due to the open, exposed, nature of the Site and its designation as an 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' and unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p>The Review sieves out sites including GB12 and GB13, then reintroduces GB12 back in at the end of the process without justification, based on land availability. Availability is not a criteria in the methodology; a fundamental flaw. There are several alternative sites that performed better in suitability and/or sustainability terms (Parcels 7, 13, 2, and 28). The sites have not all been subject to an equal consistent assessment; some broken down into 'sub-parcels' for more refined appraisal, others not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This is not a sound means of determining areas suitable for release.</p>	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. This matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will require an archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	<p>The DPD is in part based on the Green Belt Review, which is flawed. Particularly GB12 and GB13 which consistently assessed as unsuitable for release due to fulfilling two 'critical' Green Belt purposes (poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity). Much of the Green Belt Review evidence undermines the case for its subsequent inclusion. GB13 was considered particularly sensitive due to the open, exposed, nature of the Site and its designation as an 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' and unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p>The Review sieves out sites including GB12 and GB13, then reintroduces GB12 back in at the end of the process without justification, based on land availability. Availability is not a criteria in the methodology; a fundamental flaw. There are several alternative sites that performed better in suitability and/or sustainability terms (Parcels 7, 13, 2, and 28). The sites have not all been subject to an equal consistent</p>	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or landscape setting of the area. This matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will require an archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Landscape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or landscape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				assessment; some broken down into 'sub-parcels' for more refined appraisal, others not considered further due to a lack of information about ownership and availability. This is not a sound means of determining areas suitable for release.			
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	While Woking is not an 'historic town', historic assets should still be assessed, along with setting. The Green Belt Review does not do this; it neglects to consider important historic assets in the Borough.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. It is 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 Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will require archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	While Woking is not an 'historic town', historic assets should still be assessed, along with setting. The Green Belt Review does not do this; it neglects to consider important historic assets in the Borough.	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
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB15	The concern of residents is that a large influx of new patients will overwhelm existing health care facilities. Woking Borough Council has offered no solution. Education plans do not allow for children coming to live at 'West Hall' or Broadoaks. We have no state secondary school in West Byfleet. A fine balance is being maintained in terms of utilities infrastructure (gas, electricity, fresh water, waste water and sewage collection). A new electricity sub-station is to be built near the Wey Navigation. Woking Borough Council tell us they have asked the utility service providers to comment and have been told there is no problem.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the development is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the development will be served by the necessary infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB16	The concern of residents is that a large influx of new patients will overwhelm existing health care facilities. Woking Borough Council has offered no solution. Education plans do not allow for children coming to live at 'West Hall' or Broadoaks. We have no state secondary school in West Byfleet. A fine balance is being maintained in terms of utilities infrastructure (gas, electricity, fresh water, waste water and sewage collection). A new electricity sub-station is to be built near the Wey Navigation. Woking Borough Council tell us they have asked the utility service providers to comment and have been told there is no problem.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the development is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the development will be served by the necessary infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	The Council is satisfied that the draft DPD follows the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Green Belt Review recommendations for the most sustainable pattern of development. However there are conflicts between their conclusions: GB13 was not considered suitable by the Review but is a "preferred site" in the SA. The Council considered the Review identified too few sites to meet the 2040 housing land supply targets so included GB13 as a safeguarded site based on the SA, contrary to the Review.	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied. The Council has used a range of evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the DPD. The collectively justify the allocation of the proposed sites. Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper cover in detail the evidence base used to inform the DPD. The Council is satisfied that the proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives assessed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Parcel 7 is rejected from the SA as not a reasonable alternative, contrary to the Review. Council rejected Review recommendations to rationalise the Green Belt Boundary (except West Byfleet Junior and Infant School Playing Field) and release a buffer around certain sites. SA only assesses sites the Review recommends for development. A separate evidence base assesses all other reasonable alternative sites identified in the SHLAA, Employment Land Review and Topic Paper. SA does not assess sites in Parcel 31, which the Review ranked as more suitable than Parcel 9.			
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	<p>The Council is satisfied that the draft DPD follows the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Green Belt Review recommendations for the most sustainable pattern of development. However there are conflicts between their conclusions: GB13 was not considered suitable by the Review but is a "preferred site" in the SA. The Council considered the Review identified too few sites to meet the 2040 housing land supply targets so included GB13 as a safeguarded site based on the SA, contrary to the Review.</p> <p>Parcel 7 is rejected from the SA as not a reasonable alternative, contrary to the Review. Council rejected Review recommendations to rationalise the Green Belt Boundary (except West Byfleet Junior and Infant School Playing Field) and release a buffer around certain sites. SA only assesses sites the Review recommends for development. A separate evidence base assesses all other reasonable alternative sites identified in the SHLAA, Employment Land Review and Topic Paper. SA does not assess sites in Parcel 31, which the Review ranked as more suitable than Parcel 9.</p>	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied. This matter has been addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 11. The SA assesses all reasonable alternatives and the sites proposed for allocation are considered the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	Conflict between Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal, as a result of need to protect the purpose of the Green Belt whilst identifying sufficient sites to deliver unmet housing need.	None stated.	There is no conflict between the Core Strategy and the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD. Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy specifically commits the Council to carrying out a Green Belt boundary review to release land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	Conflict between Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal, as a result of need to protect the purpose of the Green Belt whilst identifying sufficient sites to deliver unmet housing need.	None stated.	There is no conflict between the Core Strategy and the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD. Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy specifically commits the Council to carrying out a Green Belt boundary review to release land to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	General	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) only partially relies on the Green Belt Review. The Council have come to their own decisions on site allocation and suitability ranking, without any further evidence base to justify this decision. The SA is not robust evidence base.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD alternates between the Green Belt Review and SA at different stages of the assessment process: Stage 2 uses the Green Belt Review, whilst stage 3 utilises the SA, creating inconsistency in the assessment methodology process.</p>	None stated.	The manner in which the Sustainability Appraisal has been used to inform the selection of preferred sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9. The conclusions of the SA support the selection of the site for allocation. The SA uses a standard framework that is objective led to ensure consistency in the assessment process. The Council does not see any contradiction between the appraisal and its conclusions. The DPD is informed by a series of evidence base studies including the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA Report. The Council is satisfied that the sites that are allocated are the most sustainable when compared with other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	General	The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) only partially relies on the Green Belt Review. The Council have come to their own decisions on site allocation and suitability ranking, without any further evidence base to justify this decision. The SA is not robust evidence base.	None stated.	The manner in which the Sustainability Appraisal has been used to inform the selection of preferred sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9. The conclusions of the SA support the selection of the site for allocation. The SA uses a standard framework that is objective led to ensure consistency in the assessment process. The Council does not see any contradiction between the appraisal and its conclusions. The DPD is informed by a series of evidence base studies including the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA Report. The Council is satisfied that the sites that are allocated are the most sustainable when compared with other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				The Site Allocations DPD alternates between the Green Belt Review and SA at different stages of the assessment process: Stage 2 uses the Green Belt Review, whilst stage 3 utilises the SA, creating inconsistency in the assessment methodology process.			
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	Concern for lancape impact of development. GB13 is open, on top of south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley, with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and Surrey Hills AONB beyond. Development could result in loss of sensitive lancape features. GB12 and GB13 together with adjoining woodland and fiel form a narrow tract of countryside stretching between the town and river valley, interrupted only by manmade gold course of different character. GB12 is bound by mature tree shrub belt, screening the urban edge of Woking. There is a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The sites are important to containing the southern edge Woking, providing a strong lancape context for the village.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	Concern for lancape impact of development. GB13 is open, on top of south-east facing slope of the Wey Valley, with connecting views between the escarpment, river valley and Surrey Hills AONB beyond. Development could result in loss of sensitive lancape features. GB12 and GB13 together with adjoining woodland and fiel form a narrow tract of countryside stretching between the town and river valley, interrupted only by manmade gold course of different character. GB12 is bound by mature tree shrub belt, screening the urban edge of Woking. There is a Tree Protection Order (TPO). The sites are important to containing the southern edge Woking, providing a strong lancape context for the village.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	Concern for historic environment impact of development. Sites GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to Pyrford Court development, surround Pyrford Conservation Area and used to be farmed. Whilst development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village it could erode the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	The Council accepts the character of Pyrford is distinctive to be protected. However, it is satisfied that it will not be compromised by the proposals. The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	Concern for historic environment impact of development. Sites GB12 and GB13 have an important role in providing a rural setting to Pyrford Court development, surround Pyrford Conservation Area and used to be farmed. Whilst development would not affect the architecture and layout of the village it could erode the rural setting of the village.	None stated.	The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB12	Development would adversely impact Pyrford Court (Registered Park and Garden, Listed Buildings), Grade II listed buildings; Pyrford Area, surrounding agricultural lancape and farms part of its setting (listed Wheelers Farm and Barn, building at Key Lees).	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB13	Development would adversely impact Pyrford Court (Registered Park and Garden, Listed Buildings), Grade II listed buildings; Pyrford Area, surrounding agricultural lancape and farms part of its setting (listed Wheelers Farm and Barn, building at Key Lees).	None stated.	The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 20 and 3. It is not envisaged that the proposals will adversely impact on the heritage assets or lancape setting of the area. this matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 19 and 7. The key requirements of the proposals will requirement archaeological survey to be carried out to inform planning application decisions. The Council has also carried out a Lancape Character Assessment and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						has robust policies to ensure that the development of the sites do not undermine the setting of any historic or lancape assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently throughout the review. The DPD is informed by a range of evidence. Collectively, they justify the allocation of the sites.	
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB15	We believe the proposal at West Hall is opportunist - the land is the, the Council has a need for housing development. Green Belt status doesn't seem to matter. The Council has the powers to carry this proposal forward, even against overwhelming opposition. But rules require consideration of siting, health and community care services, school places and utility services. The Council has not met these criteria.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council's proposals is informed by a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals, including West Hall are the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB16	We believe the proposal at West Hall is opportunist - the land is the, the Council has a need for housing development. Green Belt status doesn't seem to matter. The Council has the powers to carry this proposal forward, even against overwhelming opposition. But rules require consideration of siting, health and community care services, school places and utility services. The Council has not met these criteria.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council's proposals is informed by a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The proposals, including West Hall are the most sustainable when compared against reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB16	The West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum has established that local residents (+95%) do not want to lose any Green Belt but accept Broadoaks site is in need of employment led, mixed development.	None stated.	The Council also has responsibility to meet the employment needs of the area. Presently, Broadoaks is a Major Development Site in the Green Belt for high quality offices use. The Site Allocations DPD extends the uses on the site to include residential. In addition, the West Hall proposal will still be needed to make a contribution to the housing requirement of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB15	The Council propose to build 550 new houses and retain further land for later development. 'Broadoaks' is also recommended for release, a plan is about to be submitted by Octagon Developments for 157 new houses and a secondary school. Both will have direct access to Parvis Road and other local infrastructure.	None stated.	The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB16	The Council propose to build 550 new houses and retain further land for later development. 'Broadoaks' is also recommended for release, a plan is about to be submitted by Octagon Developments for 157 new houses and a secondary school. Both will have direct access to Parvis Road and other local infrastructure. Woking Borough Council has agreed to build not less than 292 new homes borough wide each year.	None stated.	The general approach to assessing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working with neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the cross boundary traffic implications of their development are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1155	Lesley S	Speller	GB15	Woking Borough Council has agreed to build not less than 292 new homes borough wide each year. There is enough brown field land and windfall sites until 2021/2022. Thereafter, Green Belt release. Green Belt land protects green spaces and stop one community growing into another. Other than Broadoaks, Green Belt land around West Hall is the only substantial area in West Byfleet. When it's gone, it's gone'. Once a development has started, it will swallow the rest of the land over time.	None stated.	The Housing has a housing requirement of 292 dwellings per year agreed in the Core Strategy. This is against the backdrop of an objectively assessed housing need of 517 dwellings. It is important that the Council identify sufficient land to deliver the 292 housing requirement. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is proposing that Broadoaks be allocated for employment and residential use.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB7	Mayford resident. Believes that Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough. Therefore Mayford already makes a major contribution toward the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion here. A dispersed approach would be more appropriate	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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB7	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB8	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB9	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB10	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB11	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB14	National policy states that the GB should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" and that housing need-including for Traveller sites does not justify the harm done to the GB by inappropriate development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB7	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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1250	Andrew	Spencer	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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB14	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB7	The road network in Mayford is poor and is gridlocked at peak hours. Proposals for a further 500 dwellings and a school in Mayford will exacerbate the situation	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The 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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB8	The road network in Mayford is inadequate and is congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB9	The road network in Mayford is inadequate and is congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB10	The road network in Mayford is inadequate and is congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB11	The road network in Mayford is inadequate and is congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB14	The road network in Mayford is inadequate and is congested at rush hour. The proposed development will exacerbate traffic problems.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. 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
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB7	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB8	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB9	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB10	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB11	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB14	Mayford is a key area for rainwater absorption. Development here will increase surface water and increase flood risk	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB7	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fiel	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fiel	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB9	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fiel	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB10	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fiel	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB11	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fiel	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB14	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the GB. This is misleading if it is a precursor to housing development on surrounding fiel	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB7	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. Proposals will have a devastating impact on the Village.	Reconsider plans	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB8	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. Proposals will have a devastating impact on the Village.	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
						<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> <p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB9	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. Proposals will have a devastating impact on the Village.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB10	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. Proposals will have a devastating impact on the Village.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB11	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. Proposals will have a devastating impact on the Village.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	
1250	Andrew	Spencer	GB14	The GBBR recommended the site on the basis of close proximity to the Local Centre and facilities however there is no supporting infrastructure in the Centre. Proposals will have a devastating impact on the Village.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 23.0</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB7	Objects to the proposal. Currently, 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 toward the Traveller Community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	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 Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB8	There are no local infant or primary schools within walking distance of the proposed sites, which will place greater stress on already busy, dangerous local roads, during busy periods.	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the site is within walking distance of Barnsbury Primary School. This should therefore promote sustainable methods of travel.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB9	There are no local infant or primary schools within walking distance of the proposed sites, which will place greater	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the site is within walking distance of Barnsbury Primary School. This should therefore promote sustainable methods of travel.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				stress on already busy, dangerous local roads, during busy periods.			of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB10	There are no local infant or primary schools within walking distance of the proposed sites, which will place greater stress on already busy, dangerous local roads, during busy periods.	None stated.	As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the site is just outside walking distance of Barnsbury Primary School. Nevertheless, development of the site brings with it an opportunity to provide essential transport infrastructure such as new/improved pedestrian links, cycle links and improvements to bus services.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB11	There are no local infant or primary schools within walking distance of the proposed sites, which will place greater stress on already busy, dangerous local roads, during busy periods.	None stated.	As set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the site is just outside walking distance of Barnsbury Primary School. Nevertheless, development of the site brings with it an opportunity to provide essential transport infrastructure such as new/improved pedestrian links, cycle links and improvements to bus services.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB8	As primary teachers in Woking, we have seen increases in the number of classes and pupil intake to accommodate increased demand at Goldsworth Park and St Dunstons. The increased demand from more housing would mean schools would not cope. The birth rate is Surrey and particularly working is already above national average and is increasing.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB9	As primary teachers in Woking, we have seen increases in the number of classes and pupil intake to accommodate increased demand at Goldsworth Park and St Dunstons. The increased demand from more housing would mean schools would not cope. The birth rate is Surrey and particularly working is already above national average and is increasing.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB10	As primary teachers in Woking, we have seen increases in the number of classes and pupil intake to accommodate increased demand at Goldsworth Park and St Dunstons. The increased demand from more housing would mean schools would not cope. The birth rate is Surrey and particularly working is already above national average and is increasing.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB11	As primary teachers in Woking, we have seen increases in the number of classes and pupil intake to accommodate increased demand at Goldsworth Park and St Dunstons. The increased demand from more housing would mean schools would not cope. The birth rate is Surrey and particularly working is already above national average and is increasing.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB8	Outlines 3 major traffic accidents on Hook Hill lane, showing the dangers of the road, where there is no footpath. The road is barely wide enough to accommodate two vehicles. The proposals will lead to increased traffic and an increased number of accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths, and the safety issues highlighted, to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB9	Outlines 3 major traffic accidents on Hook Hill lane, showing the dangers of the road, where there is no footpath. The road is barely wide enough to accommodate two vehicles. The proposals will lead to increased traffic and an increased number of accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths, and the safety issues highlighted, to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB10	Outlines 3 major traffic accidents on Hook Hill lane, showing the dangers of the road, where there is no footpath. The road is barely wide enough to accommodate two vehicles. The proposals will lead to increased traffic and an increased number of accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths, and the safety issues highlighted, to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB11	Outlines 3 major traffic accidents on Hook Hill lane, showing the dangers of the road, where there is no footpath. The road is barely wide enough to accommodate two vehicles. The proposals will lead to increased traffic and an increased number of accidents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths, and the safety issues highlighted, to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by 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
603	J	Spooner	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. Notes the sighting on Hook Hill Lane of a rare albino squirrel - development would have a devastating impact on this rare creature.	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 toward 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
603	J	Spooner	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. Notes the sighting on Hook Hill Lane of a rare albino squirrel - development would have a devastating impact on this rare creature.	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 toward 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
603	J	Spooner	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. Notes the sighting on Hook Hill Lane of a rare albino squirrel - development would have a devastating impact on this rare creature.	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 toward 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
603	J	Spooner	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. Notes the sighting on Hook Hill Lane of a rare albino squirrel - development would have a devastating impact on this rare creature.	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 toward 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
603	J	Spooner	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
603	J	Spooner	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	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 or railway bridges (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.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
603	J	Spooner	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 or railway bridges (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.	None stated.	This representation 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
603	J	Spooner	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 or railway bridges (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.	None stated.	This representation 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
603	J	Spooner	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 or railway bridges (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.	None stated.	This representation 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
603	J	Spooner	GB7	Concerned about statistics showing an increased local crime rate when traveller sites are located and enlarged.	None stated.	It is unclear what statistics this comment is based on and it is therefore difficult to provide a meaningful response. However, the Sustainability Appraisal of the Regulation 18 stage Site Allocations DPD includes appraisal against an objective (Objective 4) to reduce poverty, crime and social exclusion, with an indicator on recorded offences. The proposed development is considered to have neutral impacts on this objective.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB7	Concerned about the proposals and their impact on Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0, 20.0, 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB8	Concerned about the proposals and their impact on Mayford.	None stated.	This representation is dealt with in its following Sections (this is its introduction).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB9	Concerned about the proposals and their impact on Mayford.	None stated.	This representation is dealt with in its following Sections (this is its introduction).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB10	Concerned about the proposals and their impact on Mayford.	None stated.	This representation is dealt with in its following Sections (this is its introduction).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB11	Concerned about the proposals and their impact on Mayford.	None stated.	This representation is dealt with in its following Sections (this is its introduction).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
603	J	Spooner	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
603	J	Spooner	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1533	Robert	Stace	GB4	Green Belt provides protection from the noise of the M25. Central Government lied about the noise pollution generated from the road.	None stated.	The key requirements for the site note that due to the significant traffic on the M25, the development will need to consider the impacts on noise and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity. A Noise Impact Assessment would be required. The Council also has a robust policy framework to make sure that developments near sources of noise provide mitigation measures.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1533	Robert	Stace	GB15	The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	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
1533	Robert	Stace	GB4	Green Belt should 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
1533	Robert	Stace	GB15	Green Belt should 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
608	Michele	Stammers	GB19	Has no problem with the proposal for a SANG at Westfield Common, but concerned about the location of the car park and its access/ approach. Questions where this will be located.	None stated.	Support for the principle of a SANG at Westfield Common is noted. It is correct that there are a number of criteria that must be met in order for a site to be designated as a SANG. These include car parking facilities. The Council is committed to working with the relevant stakeholders in bringing forward this site as a SANG and will consider matters of detail such as car parking provision and access into and through the site at the planning application/project preparation stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1496	R	Staples	GB16	Agrees that an extra school is required but not a private school as one already closed in Pyrford.	None stated.	The Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. The Council's approach to education provision is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1496	R	Staples	GB4	Disagrees with the proposed release of Green Belt and building of 1,400 houses and a 900 pupil school. There is still a lot of Green Belt land available in the Borough. Local infrastructure is already nearly at breaking point and there are insufficient facilities to sustain an increase in population. An additional health centre will be required and roads will require rebuilding, because roads are gridlocked and residential roads are being used as short cuts, especially in Byfleet during the evening rush hour.	None stated.	It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. However, with regard to the impact on local infrastructure (of the allocated uses) and particularly on roads, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The 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
1496	R	Staples	GB5	Disagrees with the proposed release of Green Belt and building of 1,400 houses and a 900 pupil school. There is still a lot of Green Belt land available in the Borough. Local infrastructure is already nearly at breaking point and there are insufficient facilities to sustain an increase in population. An additional health centre will be required and roads will	None stated.	It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. However, with regard to the impact on local infrastructure (of the allocated uses) 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
				require rebuilding, because roads are gridlocked and residential roads are being used as short cuts, especially in Byfleet during the evening rush hour.		particularly on roads, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Council will consider all representations made in detail, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, and all other statutory and policy requirements.	
1496	R	Staples	GB12	Disagrees with the proposed release of Green Belt and building of 1,400 houses and a 900 pupil school. There is still a lot of Green Belt land available in the Borough. Local infrastructure is already nearly at breaking point and there are insufficient facilities to sustain an increase in population. An additional health centre will be required and roads will require rebuilding, because roads are gridlocked and residential roads are being used as short cuts, especially in Byfleet during the evening rush hour.	None stated.	It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. However, with regard to the impact on local infrastructure (of the allocated uses) and particularly on roads, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The 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
1496	R	Staples	GB13	Disagrees with the proposed release of Green Belt and building of 1,400 houses and a 900 pupil school. There is still a lot of Green Belt land available in the Borough. Local infrastructure is already nearly at breaking point and there are insufficient facilities to sustain an increase in population. An additional health centre will be required and roads will require rebuilding, because roads are gridlocked and residential roads are being used as short cuts, especially in Byfleet during the evening rush hour.	None stated.	It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. However, with regard to the impact on local infrastructure (of the allocated uses) and particularly on roads, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The 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
1496	R	Staples	GB15	Disagrees with the proposed release of Green Belt and building of 1,400 houses and a 900 pupil school. There is still a lot of Green Belt land available in the Borough. Local infrastructure is already nearly at breaking point and there are insufficient facilities to sustain an increase in population. An additional health centre will be required and roads will require rebuilding, because roads are gridlocked and residential roads are being used as short cuts, especially in Byfleet during the evening rush hour.	None stated.	It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. However, with regard to the impact on local infrastructure (of the allocated uses) and particularly on roads, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The 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
1496	R	Staples	GB16	Disagrees with the proposed release of Green Belt and building of 1,400 houses and a 900 pupil school. There is still a lot of Green Belt land available in the Borough. Local infrastructure is already nearly at breaking point and there are insufficient facilities to sustain an increase in population. An additional health centre will be required and roads will require rebuilding, because roads are gridlocked and residential roads are being used as short cuts, especially in	None stated.	It should be noted that the Broadoaks site on Parvis Road is not allocated for a school. The allocation is for an employment-led mixed use site to include quality offices and research premises and residential including Affordable Housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The current proposal for a 900 pupil private secondary school is a developer led scheme that will be considered as part of the planning application process. However, with regard to the impact on local infrastructure (of the allocated uses) and particularly on roads, please refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Byfleet during the evening rush hour.		Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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.	
1496	R	Staples	GB4	If Green Belt land is used, roads, water and sewage services would need to be upgraded before the development went ahead, so that extra traffic and service needs are catered for.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1496	R	Staples	GB5	If Green Belt land is used, roads, water and sewage services would need to be upgraded before the development went ahead, so that extra traffic and service needs are catered for.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1496	R	Staples	GB12	If Green Belt land is used, roads, water and sewage services would need to be upgraded before the development went ahead, so that extra traffic and service needs are catered for.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1496	R	Staples	GB13	If Green Belt land is used, roads, water and sewage services would need to be upgraded before the development went ahead, so that extra traffic and service needs are catered for.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1496	R	Staples	GB15	If Green Belt land is used, roads, water and sewage services would need to be upgraded before the development went ahead, so that extra traffic and service needs are catered for.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1496	R	Staples	GB16	If Green Belt land is used, roads, water and sewage services would need to be upgraded before the development went ahead, so that extra traffic and service needs are catered for.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1548	Kathleen	Starling	GB7	Object to increase the number of Traveller pitches on the site.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1548	Kathleen	Starling	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed development.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1548	Kathleen	Starling	GB9	Strongly object to the proposed development.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1548	Kathleen	Starling	GB10	Strongly object to the proposed development.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1548	Kathleen	Starling	GB11	Strongly object to the proposed development.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1548	Kathleen	Starling	GB8	Object to school, leisure centre and running track	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB10	National planning policy allows for the release of GB in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the release of GB for 550 homes between 2022-2027. WBC have identified more sites with an additional capacity of 1200 homes between 2027-2040. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for this	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
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB11	National planning policy allows for the release of GB in exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy requires the release of GB for 550 homes between 2022-2027. WBC have identified more sites with an additional capacity of 1200 homes between 2027-2040. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for this	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
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB10	The proposals do not take into account the Councils Core Strategy policy CS24, which requires that all development conserve, enhance and make a positive benefit to the lancape and townscape character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0. Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Lancape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB11	The proposals do not take into account the Council's Core Strategy policy CS24, which requires that all development conserve, enhance and make a positive benefit to the landscape and townscape character.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0 and Section 7.0. Any development proposal that comes forward will need to demonstrate that relevant Development Plan Policies have been met, including CS24: Woking's Landscape and Townscape.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB10	The justifications for removal from the GB are flawed. The site's location to the local centre. There is no supporting infrastructure at the local centre apart from a barbers and a Post Office. The local transport infrastructure can not cope, particularly Egleby Road. It is heavily congested at peak times already	None stated.	The representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0 and Section 8.0 The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egleby Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of 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 Egleby Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB11	The justifications for removal from the GB are flawed. The site's location to the local centre. There is no supporting infrastructure at the local centre apart from a barbers and a Post Office. The local transport infrastructure can not cope, particularly Egleby Road. It is heavily congested at peak times already	None stated.	The representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 10.0 and Section 8.0 The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egleby Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of 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 Egleby Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB10	The proposed housing density of 30dph is grossly excessive when compared with the average density of 5.5 dph or less in the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB11	The proposed housing density of 30dph is grossly excessive when compared with the average density of 5.5 dph or less in the area	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB14	The removal of GB14 from the GB to create GI is not necessary as the use is unchanged. Also exceptional circumstances has not been demonstrated	None stated.	The site formed part of a wider parcel in the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The GBBR concluded that the sites within the parcel should be comprehensively planned to include various uses including green infrastructure. This site was considered suitable for green infrastructure only due to its more prominent position at a higher point on the Escarpment of rising ground. Taking into account the wider parcel and the proposed site allocations, alongside the need to ensure a clear well defined boundary. It is considered that GB14 should be removed from the GB boundary and allocated for Green Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB10	Object to proposals in GB10, GB11 and GB14. GB serves the purpose of preventing urban sprawl. The proposals will do the opposite and remove the green land between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper 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
416	J N and L J	Starritt	GB11	Object to proposals in GB10, GB11 and GB14. GB serves the purpose of preventing urban sprawl. The proposals will do the opposite and remove the green land between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
31	Oliver	Staton	GB13	The development of this site would add to existing congestion problems in the area- specifically around Pyrford School and Coldharbour Rd	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
31	Oliver	Staton	GB13	Footpaths on the land provide access to walks and views of the Surrey Hills. Consider other brownfield sites before progressing this site	None stated.	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA28	Noise pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA29	Air pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	General	Shocking that the plans are at an advanced stage and residents are only now being informed. The documentation online simply obfuscates the matter and issues at stake, in an attempt to bamboozle local people who will clearly oppose the Council's plans. The Council will not pay heed to local views and it is hoped the objections will be taken into account to ensure the quality of life on the Barnsbury Estate during the developments and afterwards.	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD, as set out in national planning policy, only carries very limited weight as it is a draft document. With this in mind, the draft allocation of the site is not at an advanced stage and the Council has sought the views of the local community as part of the formal consultation process. The views of the community have been considered during the regulation 18 stage consultation process. The Council will take the views into account in finalising the document prior to the six week regulation 19 consultation due to take place in 2016. There is also the opportunity to express views at the Examination in Public later in the plan making process. The Council does not intend to be confusing in presenting the various documents and information. The draft document is available online as well as at various locations throughout the Borough for inspection. The Council has also attended a number of events throughout the Consultation period to raise awareness of the consultation and answer questions. Nevertheless the Council notes the representation and will consider other methods of communication for future consultation periods. it is envisaged that planning to meet 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA28	Unfair for the Council to take away gardens from residents, this will have a negative effect on their quality of life.	None stated.	Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to maximise the efficient use of land in the existing urban areas for redevelopment, intensification of use and mixed use development. The proposed allocation of UA28 would facilitate the delivery of 55 additional homes to meet local need in the existing urban area, which is close to a number of local services and facilities. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Core Strategy Policy CS21, The Design SPD and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. This will be considered in further detail at the planning application stage.	
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA29	Unfair for the Council to take away gardens from residents, this will have a negative effect on their quality of life.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to maximise the efficient use of land in the existing urban areas for redevelopment, intensification of use and mixed use development. The proposed allocation of UA28 would facilitate the delivery of 55 additional homes to meet local need in the existing urban area, which is close to a number of local services and facilities.</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. This will be considered in further detail at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA28	Noise pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA29	Noise pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	Contents of the Site Allocations DPD	Objecting The proposals will have a serious negative effect on the current local residents.	The developments on the Barnsbury Estate should not go ahead.	<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 the local area. 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 proposed modification is noted. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution toward 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	Contents of the Site Allocations DPD	Objecting The proposals will have a serious negative effect on the current local residents.	The developments on the Barnsbury Estate should not go ahead.	<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 the local area. 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 proposed modification is noted. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution toward 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	HRA Screening of Woking Site Allocations	The developments on the estate will have a negative impact on local residents.	The developments on the Barnsbury Estate should not go ahead.	<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 the local area. 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 proposed modification is noted. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution toward 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA28	The proposal will have a negative impact on traffic and congestion. The estate has narrow roads that are unsuitable for a high volume of traffic or construction traffic. This will be dangerous to people walking through the estate.	I don't these developments should go ahead. They are impractical	<p>Objection noted. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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</p>	No further modification is 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 unfair to the current local residents.	<p>Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access. 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>	
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA29	The proposal will have a negative impact on traffic and congestion. The estate has narrow roads that are unsuitable for a high volume of traffic or construction traffic. This will be dangerous to people walking through the estate.	I don't these developments should go ahead. They are impractical and unfair to the current local residents.	<p>Objection noted. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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. 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
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA28	It will reduce the value of properties.	None stated.	This is not a planning material consideration.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
745	Danuta	Staunton	UA29	It will reduce the value of properties.	None stated.	This is not a planning material consideration.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA28	Air pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA29	Air pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	General	Shocking that the plans are at an advanced stage and residents are only now being informed. The documentation	None stated.	The draft Site Allocations DPD, as set out in national planning policy, only carries very limited weight as it is a draft document. With this in mind, the draft allocation of the site is not at an	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
				online simply obfuscates the matter and issues at stake, in an attempt to bamboozle local people who will clearly oppose the Council's plans. The Council will not pay heed to local views and it is hoped the objections will be taken into account to ensure the quality of life on the Barnsbury Estate during the developments and afterwards.		<p>advanced stage and the Council has sought the views of the local community as part of the formal consultation process.</p> <p>The views of the community have been considered during the regulation 18 stage consultation process. The Council will take the views into account in finalising the document prior to the six week regulation 19 consultation due to take place in 2016. There is also the opportunity to express views at the Examination in Public later in the plan making process.</p> <p>The Council does not intend to be confusing in presenting the various documents and information. The draft document is available online as well as at various locations throughout the Borough for inspection. The Council has also attended a number of events throughout the Consultation period to raise awareness of the consultation and answer questions. Nevertheless the Council notes the representation and will consider other methods of communication for future consultation periods.</p> <p>it is envisaged that planning to meet 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>	of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA28	Unfair for the Council to take away gardens from residents, this will have a negative effect on their quality of life.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to maximise the efficient use of land in the existing urban areas for redevelopment, intensification of use and mixed use development. The proposed allocation of UA28 would facilitate the delivery of 55 additional homes to meet local need in the existing urban area, which is close to a number of local services and facilities.</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. This will be considered in further detail at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA29	Unfair for the Council to take away gardens from residents, this will have a negative effect on their quality of life.	None stated.	<p>Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to maximise the efficient use of land in the existing urban areas for redevelopment, intensification of use and mixed use development. The proposed allocation of UA28 would facilitate the delivery of 55 additional homes to meet local need in the existing urban area, which is close to a number of local services and facilities.</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. This will be considered in further detail at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA28	Noise pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA29	Noise pollution for the residents of Barnsbury during the development.	None stated.	It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	Content of the Site Allocations DPD	The proposals will have a negative impact on the estate and should be rejected outright.	The proposals will have a serious negative effect on the Barnsbury Estate! These proposals should be rejected outright for the Barnsbury Estate.	<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 the local area. 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 proposed modification is noted. All the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution toward 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA28	The proposal will have a negative impact on traffic and congestion. The estate has narrow roads that are unsuitable	Development at these sites	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				for a high volume of traffic or construction traffic. This will be dangerous to people walking through the estate.	seems impractical to the point of impossible. The proposal should be rejected outright.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	of this representation
746	Jan	Staunton	UA29	The proposal will have a negative impact on traffic and congestion. The estate has narrow roads that are unsuitable for a high volume of traffic or construction traffic. This will be dangerous to people walking through the estate.	Development at these sites seems impractical to the point of impossible. The proposal should be rejected outright.	<p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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
668	Carl	Stead	GB12	What work has been undertaken to establish the existing population requirements and the future demand.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The existing infrastructure provision and impact of development on infrastructure has been considered during both the preparation of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD. More information can be found within the Infrastructure	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Has future infrastructure works been costed?		<p>Delivery Plan on the Council's website. The Council has and is committed to continue working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that infrastructure supports future demand.</p> <p>In terms of calculating the costs of infrastructure, the Community Infrastructure Levy is an important source of infrastructure funding from developments. The Council's CIL Charging Schedule and information on what CIL will be spent on is set out on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Council agrees that infrastructure provision is essential to support development. Based on the above, the Council believe that the necessary measures are in place, based on robust evidence, to ensure that it will be delivered.</p>	
668	Carl	Stead	GB13	<p>What work has been undertaken to establish the existing population requirements and the future demand.</p> <p>Has future infrastructure works been costed?</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The existing infrastructure provision and impact of development on infrastructure has been considered during both the preparation of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD. More information can be found within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan on the Council's website. The Council has and is committed to continue working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that infrastructure supports future demand.</p> <p>In terms of calculating the costs of infrastructure, the Community Infrastructure Levy is an important source of infrastructure funding from developments. The Council's CIL Charging Schedule and information on what CIL will be spent on is set out on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Council agrees that infrastructure provision is essential to support development. Based on the above, the Council believe that the necessary measures are in place, based on robust evidence, to ensure that it will be delivered.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB15	<p>What work has been undertaken to establish the existing population requirements and the future demand.</p> <p>Has future infrastructure works been costed?</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The existing infrastructure provision and impact of development on infrastructure has been considered during both the preparation of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD. More information can be found within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan on the Council's website. The Council has and is committed to continue working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that infrastructure supports future demand.</p> <p>In terms of calculating the costs of infrastructure, the Community Infrastructure Levy is an important source of infrastructure funding from developments. The Council's CIL Charging Schedule and information on what CIL will be spent on is set out on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Council agrees that infrastructure provision is essential to support development. Based on the above, the Council believe that the necessary measures are in place, based on robust evidence, to ensure that it will be delivered.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB16	<p>What work has been undertaken to establish the existing population requirements and the future demand.</p> <p>Has future infrastructure works been costed?</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The existing infrastructure provision and impact of development on infrastructure has been considered during both the preparation of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD. More information can be found within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan on the Council's website. The Council has and is committed to continue working with the relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that infrastructure supports future demand.</p> <p>In terms of calculating the costs of infrastructure, the Community Infrastructure Levy is an important source of infrastructure funding from developments. The Council's CIL Charging Schedule and information on what CIL will be spent on is set out on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Council agrees that infrastructure provision is essential to support development. Based on the above, the Council believe that the necessary measures are in place, based on robust evidence, to ensure that it will be delivered.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB12	<p>Infrastructure has not kept pace with development. The road system is at a standstill, parking creates further congestion, the railway network is bare able to cope and the railway car park is full. Doctors surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>The situation is getting worse and the existing baseline condition needs to be improved before further population demands are placed on it.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision 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>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes, including car parking provision, will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The car park at Waitrose is included within site UA51. As set out in the DPD, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to improve the existing road and car parking arrangement and public realm.</p>	
668	Carl	Stead	GB13	<p>Infrastructure has not kept pace with development. The road system is at a standstill, parking creates further congestion, the railway network is bare able to cope and the railway car park is full. Doctors surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>The situation is getting worse and the existing baseline condition needs to be improved before further population demands are placed on it.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision 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>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes, including car parking provision, will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The car park at Waitrose is included within site UA51. As set out in the DPD, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to improve the existing road and car parking arrangement and public realm.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB15	<p>Infrastructure has not kept pace with development. The road system is at a standstill, parking creates further congestion, the railway network is bare able to cope and the railway car park is full. Doctors surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>The situation is getting worse and the existing baseline condition needs to be improved before further population demands are placed on it.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision 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>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes, including car parking provision, will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The car park at Waitrose is included within site UA51. As set out in the DPD, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to improve the existing road and car parking arrangement and public realm.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB16	<p>Infrastructure has not kept pace with development. The road system is at a standstill, parking creates further congestion, the railway network is bare able to cope and the railway car park is full. Doctors surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>The situation is getting worse and the existing baseline condition needs to be improved before further population demands are placed on it.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision 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>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Any further rail investment programmes, including car parking provision, will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The car park at Waitrose is included within site UA51. As set out in the DPD, the Council is proposing the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to improve the existing road and car parking arrangement and public realm.</p>	
668	Carl	Stead	GB12	Great concerns about the surrounding road/rail/school/doctor surgeries/shopping infrastructure following development	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>In response to the representation regarding retail provision, the Core Strategy makes provision for 93,900sqm of retail floor space across the Borough over the Plan period. This has been distributed across a number of the town and district centre sites in the Site Allocations DPD. It is expected that this substantial amount of retail floor space will serve the needs of the Borough as development comes forward.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB13	Great concerns about the surrounding road/rail/school/doctor surgeries/shopping infrastructure following development	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>In response to the representation regarding retail provision, the Core Strategy makes provision for 93,900sqm of retail floor space across the Borough over the Plan period. This has been distributed across a number of the town and district centre sites in the Site Allocations DPD. It is expected that this substantial amount of retail floor space will serve the needs of the Borough as development comes forward.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB15	Great concerns about the surrounding road/rail/school/doctor surgeries/shopping infrastructure following development	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>In response to the representation regarding retail provision, the Core Strategy makes provision for 93,900sqm of retail floor space across the Borough over the Plan period. This has been distributed across a number of the town and district centre sites in the Site Allocations DPD. It is expected that this substantial amount of retail floor space will serve the needs of the Borough as development comes forward.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB16	Great concerns about the surrounding road/rail/school/doctor surgeries/shopping infrastructure following development	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>In response to the representation regarding retail provision, the Core Strategy makes provision for 93,900sqm of retail floor space across the Borough over the Plan period. This has been distributed across a number of the town and district centre sites in the Site Allocations DPD. It is expected that this substantial amount of retail floor space will serve the needs of the Borough as development comes forward.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB12	<p>Building New Towns with infrastructure is the only way to tackle the population growth.</p> <p>Adding new development into an existing area does not work as infrastructure lags behind development.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the suggestion of developing new towns. The Green Belt boundary review assessed all of the Green Belt in Woking Borough for development needs, removing sites that contained absolute constraints such as functional flood plains and environmental designated sites. The sites identified in the DPD are considered to be the most suitable in terms of the purpose they serve against Green Belt criteria and proximity to existing services and public transport. The suggestion of a new town is not physically possible within the Borough due to the numerous constraints.</p> <p>Nevertheless the Council agrees that infrastructure should come forward to support</p>	No further modification is 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's general approach to infrastructure is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	
668	Carl	Stead	GB13	Building New Towns with infrastructure is the only way to tackle the population growth. Adding new development into an existing area does not work as infrastructure lags behind development.	None stated.	The Council notes the suggestion of developing new towns. The Green Belt boundary review assessed all of the Green Belt in Woking Borough for development needs, removing sites that contained absolute constraints such as functional flood plains and environmental designated sites. The sites identified in the DPD are considered to be the most suitable in terms of the purpose they serve against Green Belt criteria and proximity to existing services and public transport. The suggestion of a new town is not physically possible within the Borough due to the numerous constraints. Nevertheless the Council agrees that infrastructure should come forward to support development. The Council's general approach to infrastructure is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB15	Building New Towns with infrastructure is the only way to tackle the population growth. Adding new development into an existing area does not work as infrastructure lags behind development.	None stated.	The Council notes the suggestion of developing new towns. The Green Belt boundary review assessed all of the Green Belt in Woking Borough for development needs, removing sites that contained absolute constraints such as functional flood plains and environmental designated sites. The sites identified in the DPD are considered to be the most suitable in terms of the purpose they serve against Green Belt criteria and proximity to existing services and public transport. The suggestion of a new town is not physically possible within the Borough due to the numerous constraints. Nevertheless the Council agrees that infrastructure should come forward to support development. The Council's general approach to infrastructure is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB16	Building New Towns with infrastructure is the only way to tackle the population growth. Adding new development into an existing area does not work as infrastructure lags behind development.	None stated.	The Council notes the suggestion of developing new towns. The Green Belt boundary review assessed all of the Green Belt in Woking Borough for development needs, removing sites that contained absolute constraints such as functional flood plains and environmental designated sites. The sites identified in the DPD are considered to be the most suitable in terms of the purpose they serve against Green Belt criteria and proximity to existing services and public transport. The suggestion of a new town is not physically possible within the Borough due to the numerous constraints. Nevertheless the Council agrees that infrastructure should come forward to support development. The Council's general approach to infrastructure is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB12	Local councils should work together to form a plan for infrastructure improvements - not just react to infrastructure requirements after development has taken place	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB13	Local councils should work together to form a plan for infrastructure improvements - not just react to infrastructure requirements after development has taken place	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB15	Local councils should work together to form a plan for infrastructure improvements - not just react to infrastructure requirements after development has taken place	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
668	Carl	Stead	GB16	Local councils should work together to form a plan for infrastructure improvements - not just react to infrastructure requirements after development has taken place	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
669	Linda	Stead	GB12	Development should not take place 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
669	Linda	Stead	GB13	Development should not take place 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
669	Linda	Stead	General	Creating a new town with direct access to main roads and services/infrastructure would be more suitable - Wisley Airfield is a possible site to consider.	Develop a new town with supporting infrastructure. Wisley Airfield is one suitable site.	The proposed Wisley Airfield development is located within Guildford Borough. The Core Strategy makes provision for the delivery of housing within Woking Borough and the Council is committed to its comprehensive delivery. As part of the site identification process, the Council has considered a number of sites within the Green Belt. Based on all of the available evidence, including the Green Belt boundary review and Sustainability Appraisal, the sites identified in the draft Site Allocations DPD are considered to be the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives. Infrastructure provision is critical to ensuring that residents have access to services and facilities as well as making sure that adequate transport provision is in place to support	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						developments. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	
669	Linda	Stead	GB12	Pyrford Primary School is being extended to meet present needs and will not accommodate even more children.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
669	Linda	Stead	GB13	Pyrford Primary School is being extended to meet present needs and will not accommodate even more children.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
669	Linda	Stead	GB12	The building of 423 new homes will change the whole character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
669	Linda	Stead	GB13	The building of 423 new homes will change the whole character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
669	Linda	Stead	GB12	The doctors surgery in West Byfleet is already too busy and it is difficult to get an appointment, it will not cope with more people.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
669	Linda	Stead	GB13	The doctors surgery in West Byfleet is already too busy and it is difficult to get an appointment, it will not cope with more people.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
669	Linda	Stead	GB12	The roads are congested already and very little parking for the shops or school	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
669	Linda	Stead	GB13	The roads are congested already and very little parking for the shops or school	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</p>	No further modification is 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 set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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>	
268	Maureen	Stedman	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha.</p> <p>The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
268	Maureen	Stedman	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
268	Maureen	Stedman	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	<p>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
268	Maureen	Stedman	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
268	Maureen	Stedman	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
268	Maureen	Stedman	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
268	Maureen	Stedman	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
268	Maureen	Stedman	GB8	Concerned about loss of green field and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
268	Maureen	Stedman	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
268	Maureen	Stedman	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
268	Maureen	Stedman	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
268	Maureen	Stedman	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
268	Maureen	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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>	
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	GB8	Concerned about loss of green field 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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
278	Roy F	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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 (SHLAAB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAAB043). 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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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,	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 Egleby Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. With respect to concerns about the character of the area, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0. Other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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 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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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	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
				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.			
1283	Sue	Stedman	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 Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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 lancape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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	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
				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.			
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1283	Sue	Stedman	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 toward 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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB8	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarments and Rising Ground of Lancap Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB9	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB10	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB11	Land north of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 – referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission). This has not been considered, and a Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, which raises questions on validity of the review.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB8	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB11	Buffer areas for bird protection should be added to Prey Heath and Smarts Heath (SSSIs) in the same way as they are for the SPA. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin SPA which, if successful, would result in a 400m buffer zone to exclude development.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB8	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB9	Mayford is a key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Development proposed will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific flooding issues.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB8	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB9	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history.	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB10	The Green Belt review incorrectly dismissed the purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to the lack of historical character of Woking. However, Mayford does have a strong history	None stated.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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.	Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Please also refer to the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 19.0 and paragraph 7.5	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB11	There is a lack of supporting local infrastructure in terms of shops, health facilities and schools in Mayford. Residents in any major development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.		<p>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>	
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB11	The Green Belt Review's recommendation of Mayford sites is based on a 7 minute travel time from Mayford to Woking. This is unrealistic at peak times, when the journey takes over 30 minutes. There is a poor road network through the village and at three single lane bridges, where there is currently bad traffic and congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposed development. The roads can not handle the additional traffic.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	GB9	The Green Belt review was inconsistent in how it dealt with constraints in the sites reviewed. The Review rejected 10	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Acre Farm as a Traveller site.			of this representation
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1283	Sue	Stedman	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1283	Sue	Stedman	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
1553	David	Stedman	GB7	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, paragraph 12.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB8	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, paragraph 12.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB9	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, paragraph 12.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB10	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, paragraph 12.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB11	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, paragraph 12.1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB7	Object to the destruction of Green Belt. What is Green Belt supposed to do?	None stated.	The purposes of Green Belt are set out in Section 9 of the NPPF. Both the Government and Woking Borough Council attach great importance to Green Belt. Nevertheless the Council is expected and committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy by allocating specific sites to bring forward their delivery. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB8	Object to the destruction of Green Belt. What is Green Belt supposed to do?	None stated.	The purposes of Green Belt are set out in Section 9 of the NPPF. Both the Government and Woking Borough Council attach great importance to Green Belt. Nevertheless the Council is expected and committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy by allocating specific sites to bring forward their delivery. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB9	Object to the destruction of Green Belt. What is Green Belt supposed to do?	None stated.	The purposes of Green Belt are set out in Section 9 of the NPPF. Both the Government and Woking Borough Council attach great importance to Green Belt. Nevertheless the Council is expected and committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy by allocating specific sites to bring forward their delivery. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB10	Object to the destruction of Green Belt. What is Green Belt supposed to do?	None stated.	The purposes of Green Belt are set out in Section 9 of the NPPF. Both the Government and Woking Borough Council attach great importance to Green Belt. Nevertheless the Council is expected and committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy by allocating specific sites to bring forward their delivery. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB11	Object to the destruction of Green Belt. What is Green Belt supposed to do?	None stated.	The purposes of Green Belt are set out in Section 9 of the NPPF. Both the Government and Woking Borough Council attach great importance to Green Belt. Nevertheless the Council is expected and committed to the comprehensive delivery of the requirements of the Core Strategy by allocating specific sites to bring forward their delivery. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB7	The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to the existing village. The existing road network is not maintained and traffic congestion will increase.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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
						<p>Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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 condition of the existing road network should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority, who are responsible for its management and maintenance.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	
1553	David	Stedman	GB8	The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to the existing village. The existing road network is not maintained and traffic congestion will increase.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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 condition of the existing road network should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority, who are responsible for its management and maintenance.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB9	The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to the existing village. The existing road network is not maintained and traffic congestion will increase.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The condition of the existing road network should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority, who are responsible for its management and maintenance.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	
1553	David	Stedman	GB10	The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to the existing village. The existing road network is not maintained and traffic congestion will increase.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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 condition of the existing road network should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority, who are responsible for its management and maintenance.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1553	David	Stedman	GB11	The size and impact of the proposed development are massive and disproportional to the existing village. The existing road network is not maintained and traffic congestion will increase.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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 condition of the existing road network should be highlighted to the County Highways Authority, who are responsible for its management and maintenance.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed allocations on the character of Mayford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB7	The scale of the proposed developments will change the character of Mayford and Woking. Please reconsider the plans.	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
1553	David	Stedman	GB8	The scale of the proposed developments will change the character of Mayford and Woking. Please reconsider the plans.	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
1553	David	Stedman	GB9	The scale of the proposed developments will change the character of Mayford and Woking. Please reconsider the plans.	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
1553	David	Stedman	GB10	The scale of the proposed developments will change the character of Mayford and Woking. Please reconsider the plans.	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
1553	David	Stedman	GB11	The scale of the proposed developments will change the character of Mayford and Woking. Please reconsider the plans.	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
1553	David	Stedman	GB7	Land to the east of Old Woking and north of Horsell should be used for development.	None stated.	<p>Although the representation notes two new areas to be considered for future development needs, there is no detailed information provided regarding the exact location of the proposed sites.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the area to the east of Old Woking has been identified in the Site Allocations under site GB22. This has been allocated in the draft DPD as a Heritage Parkland/Country Park as it contains Woking Palace, which is an important heritage asset in the Borough. In addition a significant proportion of this area is within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, 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>functional flood plain. The site is therefore not considered by the Council to be suitable for future residential development needs. The Thames Water Sewage Treatment Works on Carters Lane is also not considered to be suitable for development due to the flooding reasons above as well as it being essential infrastructure and in full operation.</p> <p>The area north of Horsell lies within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and Zone A of the SPA, where residential development is not permitted under European legislation. This is to protect three rare species of wildlife habitat in this area. The TBH SPA and the avoidance Strategy are set out in Core Strategy Policy CS8 and on the Council's website.</p>	
1553	David	Stedman	GB8	Land to the east of Old Woking and north of Horsell should be used for development.	None stated.	<p>Although the representation notes two new areas to be considered for future development needs, there is no detailed information provided regarding the exact location of the proposed sites.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the area to the east of Old Woking has been identified in the Site Allocations under site GB22. This has been allocated in the draft DPD as a Heritage Parkland/Country Park as it contains Woking Palace, which is an important heritage asset in the Borough. In addition a significant proportion of this area is within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, a functional flood plain. The site is therefore not considered by the Council to be suitable for future residential development needs. The Thames Water Sewage Treatment Works on Carters Lane is also not considered to be suitable for development due to the flooding reasons above as well as it being essential infrastructure and in full operation.</p> <p>The area north of Horsell lies within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and Zone A of the SPA, where residential development is not permitted under European legislation. This is to protect three rare species of wildlife habitat in this area. The TBH SPA and the avoidance Strategy are set out in Core Strategy Policy CS8 and on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB9	Land to the east of Old Woking and north of Horsell should be used for development.	None stated.	<p>Although the representation notes two new areas to be considered for future development needs, there is no detailed information provided regarding the exact location of the proposed sites.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the area to the east of Old Woking has been identified in the Site Allocations under site GB22. This has been allocated in the draft DPD as a Heritage Parkland/Country Park as it contains Woking Palace, which is an important heritage asset in the Borough. In addition a significant proportion of this area is within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, a functional flood plain. The site is therefore not considered by the Council to be suitable for future residential development needs. The Thames Water Sewage Treatment Works on Carters Lane is also not considered to be suitable for development due to the flooding reasons above as well as it being essential infrastructure and in full operation.</p> <p>The area north of Horsell lies within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and Zone A of the SPA, where residential development is not permitted under European legislation. This is to protect three rare species of wildlife habitat in this area. The TBH SPA and the avoidance Strategy are set out in Core Strategy Policy CS8 and on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB10	Land to the east of Old Woking and north of Horsell should be used for development.	None stated.	<p>Although the representation notes two new areas to be considered for future development needs, there is no detailed information provided regarding the exact location of the proposed sites.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the area to the east of Old Woking has been identified in the Site Allocations under site GB22. This has been allocated in the draft DPD as a Heritage Parkland/Country Park as it contains Woking Palace, which is an important heritage asset in the Borough. In addition a significant proportion of this area is within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, a functional flood plain. The site is therefore not considered by the Council to be suitable for future residential development needs. The Thames Water Sewage Treatment Works on Carters Lane is also not considered to be suitable for development due to the flooding reasons above as well as it being essential infrastructure and in full operation.</p> <p>The area north of Horsell lies within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and Zone A of the SPA, where residential development is not permitted under European legislation. This is to protect three rare species of wildlife habitat in this area. The TBH SPA and the avoidance Strategy are set out in Core Strategy Policy CS8 and on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1553	David	Stedman	GB11	Land to the east of Old Woking and north of Horsell should be used for development.	None stated.	<p>Although the representation notes two new areas to be considered for future development needs, there is no detailed information provided regarding the exact location of the proposed sites.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the area to the east of Old Woking has been identified in the Site Allocations under site GB22. This has been allocated in the draft DPD as a Heritage Parkland/Country Park as it contains Woking Palace, which is an important heritage asset in the Borough. 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>addition a significant proportion of this area is within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, a functional flood plain. The site is therefore not considered by the Council to be suitable for future residential development needs. The Thames Water Sewage Treatment Works on Carters Lane is also not considered to be suitable for development due to the flooding reasons above as well as it being essential infrastructure and in full operation.</p> <p>The area north of Horsell lies within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and Zone A of the SPA, where residential development is not permitted under European legislation. This is to protect three rare species of wildlife habitat in this area. The TBH SPA and the avoidance Strategy are set out in Core Strategy Policy CS8 and on the Council's website.</p>	
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	Development will have a negative impact on existing and planning infrastructure, including school places, health care provision and water supply	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. In addition, education provision and utilities have been addressed in paragraphs 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB16	However development at the site will result in traffic problems as well as pressure on healthcare, schools, public transport, water and sewerage supplies. What actions will be taken to ensure responsible future development of a sustainable and joined up plan for the borough.	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.6, 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out the strategic objectives for the Borough up to 2027. It includes all areas of the Borough, including West Byfleet and sets a clear vision of what the Borough will look like by 2027 whilst providing a clear sense of direction for how the vision will be achieved. This is set out specifically in CS1. Based on the policies of the Local Development Plan and other Development Plan Documents as well as the available evidence base that underpins them, the Council is confident that the proposed Site Allocations DPD identifies the most suitable and sustainable sites for current and future development needs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB16	Broadoaks, if developed sensitively, could be a major asset for West Byfleet and meet some of our housing needs.	None stated.	<p>The proposed site allocation contains a number of locally and statutory listed assets and redevelopment of the site would need to retain and enhance the setting of these assets. Possible sensitive restoration works would also need to be considered for any development scheme, as set out in the key requirements for the allocation. The site could also deliver residential development alongside an employment scheme and this is already set out in the draft DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	Object to using Green Belt land for housing and commercial uses. The proposed uses do not comply with Green Belt policy in the NPPF.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. To clarify, the proposed allocation of the site is for residential uses only and no commercial activity is proposed.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	<p>The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to assess each site against sustainability criteria. The Council has assessed this site against the criteria and consider it to be the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The SA considered both urban area and Green Belt sites, in total 125 alternative sites were considered in the Green Belt alone. Please refer to the SA which is on the Council's website.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	Fails to see how the preservation of character and lancape character is being achieved through developing the site	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding lancape impacts has been addressed 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
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	The Green Belt and Wey Navigation are natural buffers and offer amenity value to local people. The trees act as a sound barrier between the M25 and West Byfleet. The area suffers from flooding and present challenges to environmentally responsible development.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs</p>	No further modification is 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>up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The proposed allocation sets out in the key requirements that the site must contain biodiversity improvements, with built in wildlife features and corridors, have regard to biodiversity opportunities, create a strong lancape edge and minimise the impact of development on the character and lancape and setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	Main concern is about the impact on the volume of traffic on Parvis Road. The existing traffic is already at a standstill, partly due to the development of Brooklands. Congestion will have a negative impact on emergency services. The WBC Transport Evaluation 2010 does not take into account development in this part of the borough and therefore is not relevant to the assessment of the release of Green Belt land around West Hall.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding the 2010 Transport Assessment has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0.</p> <p>The Council has also consulted with the relevant emergency services to make sure their operational requirements are not compromised as a result of the proposed allocations.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	Already designated as an area of severe water supply stress.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	Little natural green space in West Byfleet and the area around West Hall and the Wey Navigation is important for local people. Development would have a negative impact on the Wey and on wildlife. It should be protected. There will be no Green Belt left in the village if the proposals take place.	None stated.	<p>The Council notes the comment regarding the lack of open space in West Byfleet whilst agreeing that the Wey Navigation is an important wildlife and lancape corridor in the Borough. The Council also recognises that it is well used for recreational activities. The key requirements for the site note that additional green infrastructure could also be provided on land to the east which is within the same land ownership as GB15. This would act as a buffer to the Wey Navigation corridor with its distinctive character and wildlife corridor function. The proposed allocation also states that 4.7ha of public open space will be required to be provided as part of any development scheme.</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
						<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>It should be noted that the proposed allocation seeks to improve foot and cycle paths into the site whilst exploring the opportunity to improve the wider network.</p> <p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.</p>	
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	The heath centre is at capacity and above the recommended threshold.	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
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	Woking has extensive areas of Flood Zone 3 and there are no clear mitigation measures to deal with the risk of flooding, which will increase with additional development. The IDP is too vague on assessing flooding risk associated with development and with the site close to the Wey Navigation, there is risk of flooding and surface water flooding.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>To clarify, the latest Environment Agency Flood data shows that the site known as GB15 (West Hall) lies within Flood Zone 1 where development is encouraged as the risk of flooding is 'very unlikely' (less than 1 in 1000 chance of flooding occurring each year). It is noted that the southern Section of the site (adjacent to Dodd's Bridge) is in close proximity to the Wey Navigation and flood zones 2 and 3. However development of the site in combination with Su and detailed careful masterplanning design should ensure that there is no adverse impact on flooding.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1649	Rod	Steel	GB15	The IDP states that there will be a shortage of school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet by 2019.	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
846	Andrew	Steen	UA18	The site has potential for a number of town centre uses on the ground and maybe upper floors. Above would be suitable for residential development including affordable housing. The site has the potential for residential development in excess of the 67 suggested in the draft DPD. We support the allocation for a mixed use development comprising of community, leisure, offices, retail and residential development.	Additional residential provision above the 67 stated in the DPD.	<p>Support for the proposed site is noted.</p> <p>As set out in the draft allocation, it is anticipated that the site could yield at least 67 net additional dwellings as well as leisure and community uses and the re-provision of the existing office floor space. The indicative residential capacity of the site has been subject to scrutiny at an Examination and supported to be achievable. The actual number of dwellings in combination with the other proposed uses will be subject to a detailed planning application and will be considered against the policies and guidance set out in the Local Development Plan documents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
846	Andrew	Steen	UA18	Support the allocation for a mixed use development. It is a suitable and sustainable site and presents the opportunity to provide a good quality development in terms of design and provision of facilities in Woking Town Centre. It is within walking distance of shops and facilities. It could attract people into Woking due to its location and provide a visible landmark on the approach to the town centre of significant height. Given the local context, a very tall building would be possible particularly the part of the site nearest the car park and Duke Street.	None stated.	<p>Support for the proposed site is noted.</p> <p>As set out in the allocation, redevelopment of the site could have a regenerative effect on this part of the town centre. Nevertheless it will be critical that the development provides an intelligent response to the local character and context including the Town Centre Conservation Area. Further design policy and guidance is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design and the Design SPD. Any application for the redevelopment of the site will be required to comply with the site specific requirements set out in the draft DPD as well as the other policies and guidance within the Local Development Plan.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
607	Susan	Stennett	GB4	The proposed allocated flood and underground tanks etc. will only push flooding into other areas.	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
607	Susan	Stennett	GB5	The proposed allocated flood and underground tanks etc. will only push flooding into other areas.	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
607	Susan	Stennett	GB4	Objects to the proposals and is appalled by the Council taking no notice of residents thoughts and concerns, as outlined in a petition against the proposals.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524. It should be noted that the Council has responded to each representation received as part of the Regulation 18 consultation that took place in 2015. There will be further opportunities to comment on the document, at the Regulation 19 consultation in 2016 as well as at the later Examination in Public.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
607	Susan	Stennett	GB5	Objects to the proposals and is appalled by the Council taking no notice of residents thoughts and concerns, as outlined in a petition against the proposals.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524. It should be noted that the Council has responded to each representation received as part of the Regulation 18 consultation that took place in 2015. There will be further opportunities to comment on the document, at the Regulation 19 consultation in 2016 as well as at the later Examination in Public.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
607	Susan	Stennett	GB4	The Council has not accounted for the lack of health facilities in Byfleet and surrounding villages this side of the Borough.	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
607	Susan	Stennett	GB5	The Council has not accounted for the lack of health facilities in Byfleet and surrounding villages this side of the Borough.	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
607	Susan	Stennett	GB4	The roads are already at capacity and can't take more traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
607	Susan	Stennett	GB5	The roads are already at capacity and can't take more traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
607	Susan	Stennett	GB4	It looks like the Council are pushing development to the edge of the Borough, so it can forget them [local population?].	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						therefore relatively modest.	
607	Susan	Stennett	GB5	It looks like the Council are pushing development to the edge of the Borough, so it can forget them [local population?].	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
1124	Barbara	Stentiford	GB12	Pyrford is a small village (5,000+ residents). An increase of 400+ houses will increase will require infrastructure – expansion of roads, school places, health services, all eroding village character.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1124	Barbara	Stentiford	GB13	Pyrford is a small village (5,000+ residents). An increase of 400+ houses will increase will require infrastructure – expansion of roads, school places, health services, all eroding village character.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1124	Barbara	Stentiford	GB12	Woking Borough Council has focused its development plans on the area south of Woking (including, but not limited to Wisley, Ripley, Send, East Horsley and West Horsley). This will create even greater pressure on supporting infrastructure. For example, central Pyrford is already congested during rush hour.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
1124	Barbara	Stentiford	GB13	Woking Borough Council has focused its development plans on the area south of Woking (including, but not limited to Wisley, Ripley, Send, East Horsley and West Horsley). This will create even greater pressure on supporting infrastructure. For example, central Pyrford is already congested during rush hour.	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
1124	Barbara	Stentiford	GB13	I object. Even Woking Borough Council's own independent advisers, Peter Brett Associates, registered significant concerns over the proposed development of Pyrford. My reasons are: The development is on Green Belt land, which should not be seen as an easy option for development. It prevents towns from merging into one another. This would bring Pyrford closer to being a suburb of Woking.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. The report recommended the allocation of site GB12. The other evidence of the Council, including the Sustainability Appraisal supports the allocation of site GB13. 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
1124	Barbara	Stentiford	GB12	I object. Even Woking Borough Council's own independent advisers, Peter Brett Associates, registered significant concerns over the proposed development of Pyrford. My reasons are: The development is on Green Belt land, which should not be seen as an easy option for development. It prevents towns from merging into one another. This would bring Pyrford closer to being a suburb of Woking.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Pyrford and any other town or village and/or compromise its identity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
936	G	Stimson	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Pyrford Nursery and schools are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Parking is an issue around the schools. A child has been knocked over this year.	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. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking 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 medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.		<p>new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Local Planning Authority would recommend that the existing parking issues noted in the representation are highlighted to Woking Borough Council Parking Services as well as Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD is based on a robust evidence base that includes the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Transport Assessments and continued discussions between the Council and the relevant infrastructure and service providers to make sure that infrastructure and community facilities across the Borough keep up with demand.</p>	
936	G	Stimson	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Pyrford Nursery and schools are at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Parking is an issue around the schools. A child has been knocked over this year. The medical facilities are at capacity and there are long waiting times for doctor appointments.</p>	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Local Planning Authority would recommend that the existing parking issues noted in the representation are highlighted to Woking Borough Council Parking Services as well as Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD is based on a robust evidence base that includes the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Transport Assessments and continued discussions between the Council and the relevant infrastructure and service providers to make sure that infrastructure and community facilities across the Borough keep up with demand.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
461	H	Stollard	GB12	Concerned at the additional pressure the proposal will put on already congested roads around West Byfleet, and sewage and water infrastructure, and the impact that will have on our quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
461	H	Stollard	GB13	Concerned at the additional pressure the proposal will put on already congested roads around West Byfleet, and sewage and water infrastructure, and the impact that will have on our quality of life.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
461	H	Stollard	GB12	Attracted to the area due to the balance between urban amenities and rural open spaces. Continual development, significant infilling and gradual erosion of rural spaces has resulted in the pressure on local infrastructure that we have today. Strongly objects to the proposal.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development. This is outlined in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
461	H	Stollard	GB13	Attracted to the area due to the balance between urban amenities and rural open spaces. Continual development, significant infilling and gradual erosion of rural spaces has resulted in the pressure on local infrastructure that we have today. Strongly objects to the proposal.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Council aims to ensure new development provides adequate infrastructure to support new development. This is outlined in Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
461	H	Stollard	GB12	Strongly objects to the proposal, and endorses the well documented issues raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood	None stated.	Objection noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The issues raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum are considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Forum.		The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	of this representation
461	H	Stollard	GB13	Strongly objects to the proposal, and endorses the well documented issues raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	Objection noted. The reasons and justification for preparing the draft DPD and including these allocations are addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The issues raised by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum are considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design, on behalf on the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB10	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. 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
174	Robert	Stonard	GB7	I strongly object to the increase of traveller pitches on this land. Mayford already contributes to the traveller community (Burdenshott Road, Brookwood Lye, Hatchington, Ten Acre Farm). These are all concentrated in one area. No justification for further expansion in Mayford. Over the years Planning inspectors have refused applications as they reduce Green Belt openness. Urge you to reconsider your plans. Please see the response by the Mayford Village	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Society who I am happy represent my views.		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.	
174	Robert	Stonard	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB11	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB8	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB9	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
174	Robert	Stonard	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 any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. 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 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
174	Robert	Stonard	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. 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 general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. 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 general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
174	Robert	Stonard	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars	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 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</p>	No further modification is 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 traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. 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.		proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Parking to service any proposed development will be in accordance with the parking standards of the Council.	
179	June	Stonard	GB11	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a lancape assessment and lancape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the lancape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB8	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB9	I strongly object to GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB10	I strongly object to the proposal of housing on sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 which will have a major impact on this historic village. No consideration given to preserving of Mayford as a separate settlement. Any housing will fill the green spaces between Mayford and Woking, making it a suburb merging to Guildford, contrary to Green Belt policy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The Council is satisfied that the proposals can come forward without undermining the general character of the area. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The issue about the separation between Woking and Guildford is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB7	I strongly object to the increase of traveller pitches on this land. Mayford already contributes to the traveller community (Burdenshott Road, Brookwood Lye, Hatchington, Ten Acre Farm). These are all concentrated in one area. No justification for further expansion in Mayford. Over the years Planning inspectors have refused applications as they	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				reduce Green Belt openness. Urge you to reconsider your plans. Please see the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy represent my views.		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.	
179	June	Stonard	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB11	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB8	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB9	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.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the	No further modification is 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 key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	
179	June	Stonard	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 any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any planning application and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the sites are sustainable. The representation about lack of buses in the area is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand that will result from the development on the back of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand. Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses how the transport implications of the proposals are assessed and/or will be addressed. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the development in the area will require traffic mitigation measures, this can be addressed as part of the planning application process. The key requirements of the proposals requests for detailed transport assessment to be carried out to inform any planning application for the development of the site. The Council will work with the County Council to make sure that this is carried to the required standards and any adverse impacts mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
179	June	Stonard	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The 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
179	June	Stonard	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements.	None stated.	The 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
179	June	Stonard	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 any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				will be dangerous as there are no pavements.		working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Parking to service any proposed development will be in accordance with the parking standards of the Council.	
716	Nick	Stonard	GB17	Byfleet is overcrowded with little or no Green Belt in the area. Woking by contrast has much more Green Belt. Whilst Green Belt should be protected, if more housing is needed it should be in Woking not Byfleet.	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 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
716	Nick	Stonard	General	Don't believe that impartial consideration was taken on the matter and WBC are pushing their problems out to the neighbouring areas.	NO more green belt release no more house building.	<p>The Council's evidence for identifying sites for development needs is set out in Appendix 1 of the draft DPD. The documents listed have been compiled by a range of sources, including independent advisors, the County Council and Woking Borough Council. The Council believe that by assessing these evidence based documents, the sites selected will not undermine the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council note the proposed modifications. Nevertheless all the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution toward meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
716	Nick	Stonard	General	The appraisal has not been undertaken in an impartial manner and no consideration taken for the catastrophic impact on the village, roads and infrastructure.	Do NOT release any green belt in Byfleet, do NOT build any more housing in Byfleet.	<p>The Council's evidence for identifying sites for development needs is set out in Appendix 1 of the draft DPD. The documents listed have been compiled by a range of sources, including independent advisors, the County Council and Woking Borough Council. The Council believe that by assessing these evidence based documents, the sites selected will not undermine the overall purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council note the proposed modifications. Nevertheless all the proposed sites will make a significant and a meaningful contribution toward meeting the housing requirement. Not allocating any or all of the sites (or not having new sites to replace any site that is rejected) could undermine the overall delivery of the Core Strategy. The key requirements set out as part of the proposed allocations will further make sure that any adverse impacts on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt and the general environment of the area is minimised.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
716	Nick	Stonard	General	Much of Byfleet and surrounding area has already been flooded or is in danger of flooding.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
716	Nick	Stonard	General	The petition against building in the Green Belt has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
716	Nick	Stonard	General	The current infrastructure provision is inadequate and must be rectified.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
716	Nick	Stonard	General	The Green Belt must be preserved there is other land available.	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
716	Nick	Stonard	General	Parvis Road will be unusable and 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
716	Nick	Stonard	General	This removes most of the local Green Belt, while 98% of Woking's Green Belt is preserved.	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
716	Nick	Stonard	General	We definitely don't want any traveller sites, this would turn Byfleet into a waste land.	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that the Council treats all people equally and has a responsibility to house all members of the community, regardless of race, religion or way of life.</p> <p>The need for Traveller accommodation in the Borough is set out 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
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	<p>The B367 and Upshot Lane priority junction is already congested-the existing issues may indicate that it would be unsuitable</p> <p>Potential access problems on GB12 due to the substantial vegetation. The removal of substantial vegetation and trees to achieve access would be a concern.</p> <p>Could consider a roundabout at the priority junction however</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</p>	No further modification is 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 would require substantial tree loss and the area is considered of archaeological importance. Pedestrian access would be a concern due to the lack of footways and speed of traffic along these roads		<p>the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The key requirements also require the retention or re-provision of boundary planting on Upshot Lane and the retention of mature trees of amenity value on the site.</p> <p>The key requirements also notes the archaeological potential of the site and requires an archaeological investigation be undertaken.</p>	
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	Although understands the need for housing, not of this scale or on this site. Quotes: "Love your family and live each day as if it were your last, but care for the land as though you were to live a thousand years".	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 lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	There are conflicts between the Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0. See also paragraph 1.13, Section 9.0 and 17.0.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the objectives of the sustainability appraisal for the draft Site Allocation DPD are consistent with those of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	Development of GB12 and GB13 will have an impact on various heritage assets in the vicinity, including Pyrford Court and various buildings in Wheelers Farm. The lancape provides an important setting for heritage assets including Pyrford Court Registered Park and Garden and the listed buildings- development could erode the lancape particularly along Pyrford Common Road and Upshot Lane. GB12 and GB13 form part of the Conservation Area and historic maps show the field were previously farmed by local residents.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and 7.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	A total of 423 houses are proposed on the two Pyrford sites. The separating road is a major rat run. The main concern is the lack of infrastructure to support the proposals.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in 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
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	There is a lack of joined up co-ordination and fragmented responsibility in relation to infrastructure provision. This leads to inadequate infrastructure provision for the level of development proposed.	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>This representation regarding fragmented responsibilities in relation to highways 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
						education, this has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 24.0 and paragraph 3.8	
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	Various lancape impact issues have been highlighted GB12 contains substantial vegetation and is covered by TPOs GB13 is south-east facing slope with open with views to the Wey Valley and surrounding views including the Surrey Hills AONB Development on GB12 and GB13 would result in the loss of sensitive lancape views GB12 and GB13 provide an uninterrupted countryside between town and river valley. They perform an important function of containing development GB12 and GB13 are rare examples of rural lancape which have not been degraded by golf courses	None stated.	The Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24, CS17, emerging Development Management Policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views and the retention of trees of important amenity or environmental value. The key requirements note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features. There is also the requirement that proposals should have regard to the nearby Escarpment lancape and heritage assets. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	The local services, facilities and parking at Marshalls Parade are inadequate to serve a huge increase in population	None stated.	The existing shops will caters for the everyday needs of those living locally, an increase in demand will be market driven and will be addressed in due course in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS4. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	The sites in Pyrford are easy options for WBC with willing sellers for both fiel. GB13 was not recommended as appropriate in the GBBR. WBC have ignored two letters submitted by PNF raising concern s about the GBBR and have been reluctant to engage with PNF. WBC should not approve the DPD in light of the Objections. The CIL payment from one field alone will not be sufficient to pay for the extensive infrastructure required for the level of development.	None stated.	The representation regarding the inclusion of GB13 in the Site Allocation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum also posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. Responses to the questions were provided at the same meeting and these were minuted and are available online. Council Officers have also continually provided assistance to PNF in their preparation of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan. The examples above demonstrate that the Council has not been reluctant to engage with the Forum but have constructively and positively engaged with them throughout the process. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	Inadequate roads, pavements, bus service will increase traffic to the inconvenience of many particularly the elderly unless all of these are improved.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is 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. As part of these site specific measures, the 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	The GBBR should not dismiss the consideration of sites against GB purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Woking may not be a historic town but the point is still relevant in relation to the historic assets in Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0, 23.0 and 7.0 The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	Pyrford is a true unique village with a Cricket field. It has a strong heritage. The Pyrford Stone is believed to have originated from pre-historic times.	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>There is evidence of Roman occupation including pots and coins dating from the First Century AD. There are ruins from the 12th Century Newark Priory. There are records of Pyrford from William Conqueror's Domesday Survey.</p> <p>Development on GB land will cause irreparable harm to heritage features in the vicinity.</p> <p>Pyrford's charm relies on its important asset and natural lancape.</p> <p>Development on GB13 will ruin heritage views from Pyrford Escarpment.</p> <p>Landowners of GB12 have already barred access to a local path.</p>		<p>policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p>	
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	<p>Although capacity is being increased at the local primary school, it is currently full. The proposals will create a significant need and deprive families from existing families in Pyrford</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	<p>Various issues with road access and condition raised.</p> <p>Development at Wisley airfield will have significant impact on traffic, particularly along the B327.</p> <p>The width of Newark Lane is currently inadequate.</p> <p>The narrow bridge over the Wey Navigation becomes congested and there is a weight restriction on it.</p> <p>Pyrford's Common Road will become more of a race track.</p> <p>The increase in cars on Pyrford's road system is likely to cause an increase in accidents.</p>	None stated.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	<p>The SA only partially relies on GBBR. The Council have come to their own decision on the ranking without further evidence to justify its decision.</p> <p>The Site Allocation DPD draws from the GBBR and the SA rather than utilising the main document the SA. It is inconsistent to go back and forth to each document and alternate between different parts of the GBBR and SA that suit the conclusions.</p> <p>The evidence base is unsound and inconsistent.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Site Allocations DPD is informed by robust evidence, including, the Green Belt boundary review, a Sustainability Appraisal Report, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Transport Assessment and other evidence base listed in Appendix 1 of the DPD. The Council is satisfied that the proposals in the DPD are the most sustainable when compared against the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>This representation has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	<p>The proposals in combination with development at Wisley airfield for 2,100 homes (at adjoining Guildford Borough) will create significant traffic and unacceptable levels of pollution and the destruction of open space.</p> <p>WBC has a duty to co-operate with adjoining local authorities to prevent these problems.</p>	None stated.	<p>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. Please also see Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	<p>There are obvious conflicts between the SA, GBBR and the draft DPD.</p> <p>GB13 was considered unsuitable in the GBBR and dismissed. However the SA identifies it as a 'preferred site' for safeguarding for development up to 2040.</p>	None stated.	<p>The various issues raised in this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 8.0 and 9.0.</p> <p>The combined information from the substantial evidence base provide a sufficient basis to make informed judgements about the proposed allocation</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>Parcel 7 is rejected by the SA despite the GBBR recommending that it could be considered as a safeguarded site.</p> <p>WBC rejected the GBBR recommendations for rationalisation of the GB boundary except for one site- West Byfleet Junior and Infant School Playing Fiel.</p> <p>The SA assesses sites recommended in various documents including the GBBR, SHLAA, Employment Land Review and Topic Paper. However, the SA does not assess any sites within Parcel 31, which in the ranking order of Parcels within the GBBR, is considered more suitable than Parcel 9.</p>			
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	<p>The draft DPD is informed by the GBBR. However, the GBBR is flawed.</p> <p>GB12 and GB13 are consistently assessed as not being suitable for poor sustainability and high landscape sensitivity-particular reference to the Escarpment and Rising Ground policy. However sites are sieved out and then reintroduced. For example GB12 is sieved out and reintroduced based on land availability. Land availability is not identified as a criteria within the methodology and it is considered to be a fundamental flaw that availability is a key factor in determining areas suitable for release.</p> <p>There is no reasonable justification provided for the reintroduction of GB12 and GB13 once they have been discounted, particularly as other sites score higher in terms of suitability and sustainability e.g. parcels 7, 13, 2 and 28</p> <p>The sites identified in the GBBR have not be subject to equal and consistent assessment e.g. some sites have been broken down into parcels and subject to more focused appraisals, whilst others have been considered further due to lack of ownership/availability information. This is not a sound means of determining areas suitable for release.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding the various aspects of the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0, 9.0 and 8.0.</p> <p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	No main drains along Pyrford Common Road. The Bothy sewage plant discharges into Parcel GB12	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.1,3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1260	Ann	Stone	GB12	WBC has approved the draft Site Allocation DPD for public consultation on 4 June Executive, it did so without fully taking into account all the representations received. WBC chose not to review a letter that was sent by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum/LDA Design. Of which, objected to the draft DPD.	None stated.	Whilst this has been dealt with in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. Representations submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 573 and Representations submitted by LDA Design on behalf of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum can be found under Representor ID 19. You are correct that Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum had posed some questions to the Council's Executive meeting on 4 June 2015. However it should be noted that responses to the questions were provided at the same meeting, these were minuted and are available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB10	Numerous recent government and independent reports have stressed the huge value of green open public space, in improving health and well being, providing community benefits, and enabling monetary savings for the NHS.	The site should become open public green space	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development needs (beyond 2027) of the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB11	Numerous recent government and independent reports have stressed the huge value of green open public space, in improving health and well being, providing community benefits, and enabling monetary savings for the NHS.	The site should become open public green space	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development needs (beyond 2027) of the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						development needs, beyond 2027.	
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB10	The purpose and definition of the Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. These proposals do the opposite, merging Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB11	The purpose and definition of the Green Belt is to prevent needless urban sprawl and maintain essential open spaces, woodland and character between towns and villages. These proposals do the opposite, merging Mayford and Hook Heath with Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB10	Given the lack of open public green spaces in South Woking, this is the perfect opportunity for the Council to preserve Hook Heath and Mayford whilst safeguarding public green open space for all to enjoy, rather than developing the sites for high density, low quality homes (in the immediate and longer term).	Preserve Hook Heath and Mayford and safeguard public green open space for all	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB11	Given the lack of open public green spaces in South Woking, this is the perfect opportunity for the Council to preserve Hook Heath and Mayford whilst safeguarding public green open space for all to enjoy, rather than developing the sites for high density, low quality homes (in the immediate and longer term).	Preserve Hook Heath and Mayford, safeguard public green open space for all	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0 and 9.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB10	Deeply concerned about the hugely negative, damaging proposals. Recommends these sites do not have their Green Belt status removed but become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	These sites should not have their Green Belt status removed and should instead become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB11	Deeply concerned about the hugely negative, damaging proposals. Recommends these sites do not have their Green Belt status removed but become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	These sites should not have their Green Belt status removed and should instead become designated areas of publicly accessible green open space; a natural country park.	This suggestion provides a laudable use for these sites, which may be supported if there were no housing need in the Borough, or plentiful reasonable alternative sites to meet development needs before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development needs in the Borough, as comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0. It should also be noted that site GB14, which lies adjacent to site GB10 is safeguarded for Green Infrastructure to help meet long term development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB10	While recognising the need to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable, quality character long term housing, the current proposals are in complete contradiction to National Planning Policy. The proposals show deep disregard and seemingly wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open spaces and woodland, and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. Sections 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0 provide further relevant information. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB11	While recognising the need to plan into the future and accommodate growing need for affordable, quality character long term housing, the current proposals are in complete contradiction to National Planning Policy. The proposals show deep disregard and seemingly wanton desire to significantly reduce the Green Belt, build on essential green public open spaces and woodland, and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.	None stated.	There has been a thorough assessment of reasonable alternative sites to inform the selection of preferred sites, including this one. This is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 9.0, 10.0 and 11.0. Sections 12.0, 21.0 and 23.0 provide further relevant information. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB10	Outlines the NPPF requirement to clearly demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances where release of land from the Green Belt is proposed. Acknowledges the need for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but an exceptional need for 1200 or any number of homes in the Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1521	Karen	Stoner	GB11	Outlines the NPPF requirement to clearly demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances where release of land from the Green Belt is proposed. Acknowledges the need for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but an exceptional need for 1200 or any number of homes in the Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
935	Pam	Stovall	GB8	Share same views as Mayford Village Society.	None stated.	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
935	Pam	Stovall	GB9	Share same views as Mayford Village Society.	None stated.	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
935	Pam	Stovall	GB10	Share same views as Mayford Village Society.	None stated.	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
935	Pam	Stovall	GB11	Share same views as Mayford Village Society.	None stated.	The representation from Mayford Village Society has been responded to under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
935	Pam	Stovall	GB7	Object to increasing the number of pitches on the site. The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area.	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 Lancapre 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 lancapre grounds. The Lancapre 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 lancapre 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	No further modification is 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.	
935	Pam	Stovall	GB8	Object to housing on sites. Mayford will become a Woking suburb and lose its character.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding 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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB9	Object to housing on sites. Mayford will become a Woking suburb and lose its character.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding 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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB10	Object to housing on sites. Mayford will become a Woking suburb and lose its character.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding 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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB11	Object to housing on sites. Mayford will become a Woking suburb and lose its character.	None stated.	The representation regarding flooding 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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB8	Low lying areas will flood from run off and poor drainage.	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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB9	Low lying areas will flood from run off and poor drainage.	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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB10	Low lying areas will flood from run off and poor drainage.	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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB11	Low lying areas will flood from run off and poor drainage.	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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB8	Will destroy wildlife habitat.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features 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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB9	Will destroy wildlife habitat.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						approval of the development.	
935	Pam	Stovall	GB10	Will destroy wildlife habitat.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features 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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB11	Will destroy wildlife habitat.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features 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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB8	Increase in housing will cause gridlock.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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</p>	No further modification is 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>	
935	Pam	Stovall	GB9	Increase in housing will cause gridlock.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB10	Increase in housing will cause gridlock.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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
935	Pam	Stovall	GB11	Increase in housing will cause gridlock.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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 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>	
798	Angela	Stovold	UA28	Aware that new housing is needed but concerned that issues have not been taken into account. Traffic and construction traffic will disrupt local life. The roads are already dangerous and mitigation works will need to be considered. The roads are narrow and will not be able to cope.	Mitigation measures to improve the road network.	<p>It is recognised that during the development of any site, disruption can occur at a local level. Nevertheless, this can be managed through mitigation measures and planning conditions. Any local disruption is likely to be short term.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and significant improvements to highways network. 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
798	Angela	Stovold	UA28	Lack of play spaces for children. There is nothing for teenage children to do in the area and an increase in population could result in previous problems with people hanging around in the streets.	None stated.	The provision of play equipment for children of all ages is an important requirement for new development. Part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) goes toward the provision of play equipment and open space. Therefore the Council is satisfied that the proposed development will be well served by supporting infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
798	Angela	Stovold	Pathways of Impact	Concerned the proposal will have a negative impact on quality of life due to the disruption caused. The area is also home to wildlife within mature trees.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall,	No further modification is 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 social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p> <p>At the Development Management stage, the Council will carefully consider the impact of the proposed development on local wildlife and trees. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a 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. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
798	Angela	Stovold	UA28	All comments raised should be addressed, Current residents should be able to have an input into the proposals in order for it to be an asset to the area, not a problem.	None stated.	The comments received as part of the Site Allocations DPD regulation 18 consultation have all been addressed and this is set out on the Council's website. The Council has taken the representations into account in preparing the document for Regulation 19 consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
798	Angela	Stovold	UA28	Areas with fewer issues should be considered first such as industrial estates.	Consider industrial estates first as they offer fewer development issues	The suggestion for redeveloping industrial estates is noted by the Council. The Council have assessed brownfield sites including empty offices and industrial estates that can be developed for housing and/or alternative uses. However, the amount of land identified from this source is insufficient to meet development requirements over the entire plan period. It is also important to acknowledge that whilst the focus has been on residential development the Council also has a responsibility to identify sufficient land to meet its economic requirements. Evidence of previously developed land assessed is contained the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Employment Land Review, Employment Topic Paper and the SA Report for the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
798	Angela	Stovold	Consultation and next steps	When will the public be notified of the next stages of the process	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
798	Angela	Stovold	UA28	Lack of amenities in the area as the local shop has closed down.	None stated.	The Barnsbury Shopping Parade serves the day to day needs of local people. The proposed development of the site would increase the number of people living within the local area and increase viability and vibrancy of the area. In addition the site is well served by public transport with regular access to Woking Town Centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
798	Angela	Stovold	UA28	Need to consider the impact on wildlife as there are a number of old trees.	None stated.	The key requirements for the allocation note that existing trees of amenity value should be protected. The Council will consider the biodiversity and amenity value of all trees within the site area at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	General	There is a national shortage of homes. Many people are finding it EXTREMELY difficult to find a home other than renting at exorbitant costs without long term security for later life. I understand what pressure councils are under.	None stated.	The comments are note. The proposed allocations will make a significant contribution toward meeting housing needs in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	General	However, I am incredulous at the proposals for Byfleet in the near future and the few years hence. Green Belt is to PREVENT neighbouring towns merging in to one another and safeguard the countryside from encroachment.	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. It is not envisaged that the allocations will merge Byfleet with other areas of the Borough.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	General	Concerned about the potential for more flooding as the weather patterns are changing in the northern hemisphere - what proposals are being made to prevent larger areas of Byfleet becoming flooded?	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. The Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without exacerbating flood risk 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
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	General	Development of the canal side and retail will bring jobs. These will probably not benefit local people as workers will drive in from other areas, as has happened in the Brooklands development.	None stated.	Comments noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	GB16	Plans for Broadoaks use a brown field site. This MUST be a way forward, also usage of houses not in use.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the future development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the development need over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	GB15	Plans for West Hall are totally impractical. The only access is Parvis Road A245. Projects would add 750 houses to Byfleet and West Byfleet. A 2008 Surrey study of traffic pollution found the A245 had an incredible 42,500 vehicle journeys a day. Traffic has increased since.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	GB16	Plans for West Hall are totally impractical. The only access is Parvis Road A245. Projects would add 750 houses to Byfleet and West Byfleet. A 2008 Surrey study of traffic pollution found the A245 had an incredible 42,500 vehicle journeys a day. Traffic has increased since.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	General	The proposals and explanations provided by Planning Policy at the meeting are ill thought out and prepared. I strongly object, particularly as other petitions with 2500 names have been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	General	Concern about the safety of residents of Byfleet and West Byfleet when rush hour traffic causes gridlock, affecting access for emergency services to existing and new homes on the A245.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1188	D.A.	Streatfield	GB16	The school is a private school, does not serve Byfleet and West Byfleet well.	None stated.	The DPD does not allocate the site for a school.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB10	Parcel 20 is within 5km of SAC and 400m of SSSI	None stated.	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken on the draft Site Allocation DPD, this assessed the likely significant effects of the proposals on European designated sites, this includes the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC. The HRA concluded that draft Site Allocation DPD as having no likelihood of leading to significant adverse effects on European sites and acknowledged there was sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG) to mitigate against recreational pressures of new housing on the SPA.</p> <p>SSSI are not European designated sites with the same policy justification for their protection. Therefore, the 400m exclusion zone does not apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB11	Parcel 20 is within 5km of SAC and 400m of SSSI	None stated.	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken on the draft Site Allocation DPD, this assessed the likely significant effects of the proposals on European designated sites, this includes the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC. The HRA concluded that draft Site Allocation DPD as having no likelihood of leading to significant adverse effects on European sites and acknowledged there was sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG) to mitigate against recreational pressures of new housing on the SPA.</p> <p>SSSI are not European designated sites with the same policy justification for their protection. Therefore, the 400m exclusion zone does not apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB14	Parcel 20 is within 5km of SAC and 400m of SSSI	None stated.	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken on the draft Site Allocation DPD, this assessed the likely significant effects of the proposals on European designated sites, this includes the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC. The HRA concluded that draft Site Allocation DPD as having no likelihood of leading to significant adverse effects on European sites and acknowledged there was sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG) to mitigate against recreational pressures of new housing on the SPA.</p> <p>SSSI are not European designated sites with the same policy justification for their protection. Therefore, the 400m exclusion zone does not apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB8	An independent professional should review the GBBR report. It is questionable whether the task has been undertaken objectively	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB9	An independent professional should review the GBBR report. It is questionable whether the task has been undertaken objectively	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB10	An independent professional should review the GBBR report. It is questionable whether the task has been undertaken objectively	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
295	Howard	Street	GB11	An independent professional should review the GBBR report. It is questionable whether the task has been undertaken objectively	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB14	An independent professional should review the GBBR report. It is questionable whether the task has been undertaken objectively	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB8	<p>Objects to development on site GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.</p> <p>Considers that proposals for Mayford have been predetermined and considers the GBBR report which identifies the site/s as 'most favourable' to be flawed.</p> <p>The GBBR report is focused on deliverability, sustainability and suitability of the sites as justification for their removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Considers that the sites fulfil the main purpose of the Green Belt and therefore there is no justification for their removal.</p> <p>The GBBR report's interpretation of GB policy is subjective- for example what is considered 'sprawl'</p>	None stated.	<p>The sites proposed for allocation are supported through a series of assessments and technical evidence. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.13</p> <p>Comments about the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB9	<p>Objects to development on site GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.</p> <p>Considers that proposals for Mayford have been predetermined and considers the GBBR report which identifies the site/s as 'most favourable' to be flawed.</p> <p>The GBBR report is focused on deliverability, sustainability and suitability of the sites as justification for their removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Considers that the sites fulfil the main purpose of the Green Belt and therefore there is no justification for their removal.</p> <p>The GBBR report's interpretation of GB policy is subjective- for example what is considered 'sprawl'</p>	None stated.	<p>The sites proposed for allocation are supported through a series of assessments and technical evidence. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.13</p> <p>Comments about the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB10	<p>Objects to development on site GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.</p> <p>Considers that proposals for Mayford have been predetermined and considers the GBBR report which identifies the site/s as 'most favourable' to be flawed.</p> <p>The GBBR report is focused on deliverability, sustainability and suitability of the sites as justification for their removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Considers that the sites fulfil the main purpose of the Green Belt and therefore there is no justification for their removal.</p> <p>The GBBR report's interpretation of GB policy is subjective- for example what is considered 'sprawl'</p>	None stated.	<p>The sites proposed for allocation are supported through a series of assessments and technical evidence. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.13</p> <p>Comments about the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB11	<p>Objects to development on site GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.</p> <p>Considers that proposals for Mayford have been predetermined and considers the GBBR report which identifies the site/s as 'most favourable' to be flawed.</p>	None stated.	<p>The sites proposed for allocation are supported through a series of assessments and technical evidence. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.13</p> <p>Comments about the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0</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>The GBBR report is focused on deliverability, sustainability and suitability of the sites as justification for their removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Considers that the sites fulfil the main purpose of the Green Belt and therefore there is no justification for their removal.</p> <p>The GBBR report's interpretation of GB policy is subjective- for example what is considered 'sprawl'</p>			
295	Howard	Street	GB14	<p>Objects to development on site GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14.</p> <p>Considers that proposals for Mayford have been predetermined and considers the GBBR report which identifies the site/s as 'most favourable' to be flawed.</p> <p>The GBBR report is focused on deliverability, sustainability and suitability of the sites as justification for their removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Considers that the sites fulfil the main purpose of the Green Belt and therefore there is no justification for their removal.</p> <p>The GBBR report's interpretation of GB policy is subjective- for example what is considered 'sprawl'</p>	None stated.	<p>The sites proposed for allocation are supported through a series of assessments and technical evidence. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly 1.13</p> <p>Comments about the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB8	Parcel 20 is within 5km of SAC and 400m of SSSI	None stated.	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken on the draft Site Allocation DPD, this assessed the likely significant effects of the proposals on European designated sites, this includes the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC. The HRA concluded that draft Site Allocation DPD as having no likelihood of leading to significant adverse effects on European sites and acknowledged there was sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG) to mitigate against recreational pressures of new housing on the SPA.</p> <p>SSSI are not European designated sites with the same policy justification for their protection. Therefore, the 400m exclusion zone does not apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB9	Parcel 20 is within 5km of SAC and 400m of SSSI	None stated.	<p>A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken on the draft Site Allocation DPD, this assessed the likely significant effects of the proposals on European designated sites, this includes the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC. The HRA concluded that draft Site Allocation DPD as having no likelihood of leading to significant adverse effects on European sites and acknowledged there was sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG) to mitigate against recreational pressures of new housing on the SPA.</p> <p>SSSI are not European designated sites with the same policy justification for their protection. Therefore, the 400m exclusion zone does not apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB8	<p>WBC approach to providing 4964 homes is piecemeal and inadequate. WBC have not considered alternative solutions for example the possibility of self contained settlements.</p> <p>WBC should cooperate with adjoining authorities to put forward a proposal on former MOD land for a self contained settlement. This will ensure many benefits.</p>	Cooperate with adjoining authorities to bring forward a proposal on former MOD land which could accommodate a self contained	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.5, Section 6.0, Section 9.0 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
					settlement		
295	Howard	Street	GB9	<p>WBC approach to providing 4964 homes is piecemeal and inadequate. WBC have not considered alternative solutions for example the possibility of self contained settlements.</p> <p>WBC should cooperate with adjoining authorities to put forward a proposal on former MOD land for a self contained settlement. This will ensure many benefits.</p>	Cooperate with adjoining authorities to bring forward a proposal on former MOD land which could accommodate a self contained settlement	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.5, Section 6.0, Section 9.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB10	<p>WBC approach to providing 4964 homes is piecemeal and inadequate. WBC have not considered alternative solutions for example the possibility of self contained settlements.</p> <p>WBC should cooperate with adjoining authorities to put forward a proposal on former MOD land for a self contained settlement. This will ensure many benefits.</p>	Cooperate with adjoining authorities to bring forward a proposal on former MOD land which could accommodate a self contained settlement	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.5, Section 6.0, Section 9.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB11	<p>WBC approach to providing 4964 homes is piecemeal and inadequate. WBC have not considered alternative solutions for example the possibility of self contained settlements.</p> <p>WBC should cooperate with adjoining authorities to put forward a proposal on former MOD land for a self contained settlement. This will ensure many benefits.</p>	Cooperate with adjoining authorities to bring forward a proposal on former MOD land which could accommodate a self contained settlement	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.5, Section 6.0, Section 9.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB14	<p>WBC approach to providing 4964 homes is piecemeal and inadequate. WBC have not considered alternative solutions for example the possibility of self contained settlements.</p> <p>WBC should cooperate with adjoining authorities to put forward a proposal on former MOD land for a self contained settlement. This will ensure many benefits.</p>	Cooperate with adjoining authorities to bring forward a proposal on former MOD land which could accommodate a self contained settlement	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.5, Section 6.0, Section 9.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB8	<p>The GBBR is flawed. Parcel 20 ranks number 1 for strategic accessibility. Ignoring the limited road access and railway crossings.</p> <p>Evidence base suggests that the impact on roads can be mitigated however without a clear proposal Parcel 20 cannot be ranked the highest sustainability</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0</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; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB9	<p>The GBBR is flawed. Parcel 20 ranks number 1 for strategic accessibility. Ignoring the limited road access and railway crossings.</p> <p>Evidence base suggests that the impact on roads can be</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				mitigated however without a clear proposal Parcel 20 cannot be ranked the highest sustainability		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	
295	Howard	Street	GB10	The GBBR is flawed. Parcel 20 ranks number 1 for strategic accessibility. Ignoring the limited road access and railway crossings. Evidence base suggests that the impact on roads can be mitigated however without a clear proposal Parcel 20 cannot be ranked the highest sustainability	None stated.	This representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0 The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB11	The GBBR is flawed. Parcel 20 ranks number 1 for strategic accessibility. Ignoring the limited road access and railway crossings. Evidence base suggests that the impact on roads can be mitigated however without a clear proposal Parcel 20 cannot be ranked the highest sustainability	None stated.	This representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0 The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB14	The GBBR is flawed. Parcel 20 ranks number 1 for strategic accessibility. Ignoring the limited road access and railway crossings. Evidence base suggests that the impact on roads can be mitigated however without a clear proposal Parcel 20 cannot be ranked the highest sustainability	None stated.	This representation regarding the Green Belt Boundary Review has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0 The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB8	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of safeguarding the countryside from Encroachment. Particular reference made to view at GB10 and GB11.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0, Section 7.0 particularly paragraph 7.3 and 7.4. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB9	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of safeguarding the countryside from Encroachment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0, Section 7.0 particularly paragraph 7.3 and 7.4. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB10	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of safeguarding the countryside from Encroachment. Distant views at GB10 and GB11 have already been spoilt	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0, Section 7.0 particularly paragraph 7.3 and 7.4. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB11	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of safeguarding the countryside from Encroachment. Distant views at GB10 and GB11 have already been spoilt	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0, Section 7.0 particularly paragraph 7.3 and 7.4. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition,	No further modification is 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 confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	
295	Howard	Street	GB14	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of safeguarding the countryside from Encroachment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 15.0, Section 7.0 particularly paragraph 7.3 and 7.4.</p> <p>Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the lancape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB8	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of restricting sprawl. Particular reference to open views from Egley Road	None stated.	<p>In response to comments about the Green Belt function. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 particularly paragraph 10.3 and 10.4</p> <p>In response to comments about lancape views. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed 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
295	Howard	Street	GB9	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of restricting sprawl. Particular reference to open views from Egley Road	None stated.	<p>In response to comments about the Green Belt function. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 particularly paragraph 10.3 and 10.4</p> <p>In response to comments about lancape views. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed 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
295	Howard	Street	GB10	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of restricting sprawl. Particular reference to open views from Egley Road	None stated.	<p>In response to comments about the Green Belt function. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 particularly paragraph 10.3 and 10.4</p> <p>In response to comments about lancape views. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed 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
295	Howard	Street	GB11	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of restricting sprawl. Particular reference to open views from Egley Road	None stated.	<p>In response to comments about the Green Belt function. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 particularly paragraph 10.3 and 10.4</p> <p>In response to comments about lancape views. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed 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
295	Howard	Street	GB14	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of restricting sprawl. Particular reference to open views from Egley Road	None stated.	<p>In response to comments about the Green Belt function. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 particularly paragraph 10.3 and 10.4</p> <p>In response to comments about lancape views. This part of the representation has been comprehensively addressed 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
295	Howard	Street	GB8	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of preventing coalescence. The sites preserve the character of Mayford	None stated.	<p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB9	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of preventing coalescence. The sites preserve the character of Mayford	None stated.	<p>The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. 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
						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	
295	Howard	Street	GB10	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of preventing coalescence. The sites preserve the character of Mayford	None stated.	The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB11	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of preventing coalescence. The sites preserve the character of Mayford	None stated.	The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
295	Howard	Street	GB14	All sites identified in Mayford meet the GB function of preventing coalescence. The sites preserve the character of Mayford	None stated.	The special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 12.0 paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB8	Object to proposals in Mayford. The land fulfils the purpose of the GB by keeping Mayford and Woking separate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB9	Object to proposals in Mayford. The land fulfils the purpose of the GB by keeping Mayford and Woking separate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB10	Object to proposals in Mayford. The land fulfils the purpose of the GB by keeping Mayford and Woking separate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB11	Object to proposals in Mayford. The land fulfils the purpose of the GB by keeping Mayford and Woking separate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB14	Object to proposals in Mayford. The land fulfils the purpose of the GB by keeping Mayford and Woking separate	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB8	The conclusions in the GBBR is flawed, there is no justification for the including parcel 20 except that developers have indicated its available.	Consider better planning options	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB9	The conclusions in the GBBR is flawed, there is no justification for the including parcel 20 except that developers have indicated its available.	Consider better planning options	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB10	The conclusions in the GBBR is flawed, there is no justification for the including parcel 20 except that developers have indicated its available.	Consider better planning options	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 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
340	Jennifer	Street	GB11	The conclusions in the GBBR is flawed, there is no justification for the including parcel 20 except that developers have indicated its available.	Consider better planning options	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
340	Jennifer	Street	GB14	The conclusions in the GBBR is flawed, there is no justification for the including parcel 20 except that developers have indicated its available.	Consider better planning options	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
86	Brian	Strong	GB12	Strong objection to proposed sites at Pyrford. The local road infrastructure is already busy and will not support all the new homes	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
86	Brian	Strong	GB12	What about other infrastructure issues such as the provision of additional school places and medical care?	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
86	Brian	Strong	GB12	The removal of trees as a result of proposals (including TPOs) would blight the lancape	None stated.	The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
86	Brian	Strong	GB13	Strong objection to proposed sites at Pyrford. The local road infrastructure is already busy and will not support all the new homes	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
86	Brian	Strong	GB13	What about other infrastructure issues such as the provision of additional school places and medical care?	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
86	Brian	Strong	GB13	The removal of trees as a result of proposals (including TPOs) would blight the lancape	None stated.	The Council accepts the character of Pyrford is distinctive to be protected. However, it is satisfied that it will not be compromised by the proposals. The lancape implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Section 7.	of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB4	Reference is made to the area being an Urban Environment as if that makes it a valid reason for building on the GB here. If the area is an Urban Environment this would strengthen the argument for protecting the GB here	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB5	Reference is made to the area being an Urban Environment as if that makes it a valid reason for building on the GB here. If the area is an Urban Environment this would strengthen the argument for protecting the GB here	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB15	Reference is made to the area being an Urban Environment as if that makes it a valid reason for building on the GB here. If the area is an Urban Environment this would strengthen the argument for protecting the GB here	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB16	Reference is made to the area being an Urban Environment as if that makes it a valid reason for building on the GB here. If the area is an Urban Environment this would strengthen the argument for protecting the GB here	None stated.	<p>Whilst this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB4	Object to proposed release of GB land in Byfleet and West Byfleet, particularly West Hall. The area experiences significant congestion, the worst being along Parvis Road. The proposals along Parvis Road would be planning insanity. In a recent consultation WBC's Planning Policy Manager stated that traffic management measures would be a viable way to manage increased traffic from any new building development. The traffic is already unsustainable without more building.	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
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB5	Object to proposed release of GB land in Byfleet and West Byfleet, particularly West Hall. The area experiences significant congestion, the worst being along Parvis Road. The proposals along Parvis Road would be planning insanity. In a recent consultation WBC's Planning Policy Manager stated that traffic management measures would be a viable way to manage increased traffic from any new building development. The traffic is already unsustainable without more building.	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
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB15	Object to proposed release of GB land in Byfleet and West Byfleet, particularly West Hall. The area experiences significant congestion, the worst being along Parvis Road. The proposals along Parvis Road would be planning insanity. In a recent consultation WBC's Planning Policy Manager stated that traffic management measures would be a viable way to manage increased traffic from any new building	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development. The traffic is already unsustainable without more building.		<p>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>	
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB16	<p>Object to proposed release of GB land in Byfleet and West Byfleet, particularly West Hall.</p> <p>The area experiences significant congestion, the worst being along Parvis Road. The proposals along Parvis Road would be planning insanity.</p> <p>In a recent consultation WBC's Planning Policy Manager stated that traffic management measures would be a viable way to manage increased traffic from any new building development. The traffic is already unsustainable without more building.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB4	The GBBR does not take into consideration brownfield sites. The GB should not be released for housing until all brownfield sites have been exhausted	Consider all brownfield sites before releasing GB land	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB5	The GBBR does not take into consideration brownfield sites. The GB should not be released for housing until all brownfield sites have been exhausted	Consider all brownfield sites before releasing GB land	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB15	The GBBR does not take into consideration brownfield sites. The GB should not be released for housing until all brownfield sites have been exhausted	Consider all brownfield sites before releasing GB land	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB16	The GBBR does not take into consideration brownfield sites. The GB should not be released for housing until all brownfield sites have been exhausted	Consider all brownfield sites before releasing GB land	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0, 7.0 and 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB4	Concerned that GB sites being put forward is a 'done deal'. WBC should be more accountable to the wishes of it's residents and withstand the pressure from Government	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB5	Concerned that GB sites being put forward is a 'done deal'. WBC should be more accountable to the wishes of it's residents and withstand the pressure from Government	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB15	Concerned that GB sites being put forward is a 'done deal'. WBC should be more accountable to the wishes of it's residents and withstand the pressure from Government	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
404	Kevin	Strudwick	GB16	Concerned that GB sites being put forward is a 'done deal'. WBC should be more accountable to the wishes of it's residents and withstand the pressure from Government	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB12	<p>Concerned about the erosion of the Green Belt. As local residents they have particular insight of the issues and are well informed to make comments on the proposals.</p> <p>The morning and evening traffic on Church Hill Road is extreme- with commuters coming from the direction of the M25 and A3 (the alternative route through Send is even busier)</p> <p>Anyone commuting between London/Guildford needs to access the A3 through Ripley. The road cannot cope even now, without the proposals</p> <p>400 extra houses would mean approx. 600 extra cars and 1000 extra journeys per day. The road infrastructure cannot cope and there is no prospect or plan to make improvements.</p> <p>There is no prospect for increasing the train capacity between West Byfleet and London or capacity within the train station car parks . The service at peak times is standing room only with no option to increase.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB12	The schools in the area are at capacity.	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
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB12	Doctors surgeries are 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
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB12	Social Services are at capacity.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB12	There are no supermarkets within walking distance so this will encourage even more car journeys.	None stated.	The site is in close proximity to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre to meet day to day needs of residents. The Council accepts that it is not be possible to have a supermarket in each community.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB12	Objects to any removal of land from the GB, however particular objection to land at Pyrford due to its proximity to Grade 1 LB- where proposals will affect the unique character of the building and area	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the lancape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the lancape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB13	<p>Concerned about the erosion of the Green Belt. As local residents they have particular insight of the issues and are well informed to make comments on the proposals.</p> <p>The morning and evening traffic on Church Hill Road is extreme- with commuters coming from the direction of the M25 and A3 (the alternative route through Send is even busier)</p> <p>Anyone commuting between London/Guildford needs to access the A3 through Ripley. The road cannot cope even now, without the proposals</p> <p>400 extra houses would mean approx. 600 extra cars and 1000 extra journeys per day. The road infrastructure cannot cope and there is no prospect or plan to make improvements.</p> <p>There is no prospect for increasing the train capacity between West Byfleet and London or capacity within the train station car parks . The service at peak times is standing room only with no option to increase.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB13	The schools in the area are at capacity.	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
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB13	Doctors surgeries are 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
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB13	Social Services are at capacity.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will make sure that the development is supported by the necessary infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB13	There are no supermarkets within walking distance so this will encourage even more car journeys.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that every community will have a supermarket within walking distance. The site is in close proximity to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre that will provide facilities to meet the day to day needs of residents. This will help minimise the need to travel.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
109	Bruce	Stuart	GB13	Objects to any removal of land from the GB, however particular objection to land at Pyrford due to its proximity to Grade 1 LB- where proposals will affect the unique character of the building and area	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	No further modification is 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 the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the lancape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the lancape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area. It is not expected that the proposals will adversely affect the heritage assets of the area. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 19 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
423	Marie	Stuart	GB7	Ten Acre is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI, additional expansion would have further impact on the wildlife in the area.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	Saunders Lane is affected by flooding the development of areas that provide natural drainage will exacerbate the problems here.	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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	Saunders Lane is affected by flooding the development of areas that provide natural drainage will exacerbate the problems here.	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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	Utilities capacity is also a problem in the area, problem areas include water and electricity supply and sewerage network.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.9-311	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	Utilities capacity is also a problem in the area, problem areas include water and electricity supply and sewerage network.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.9-311	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB8	Object to proposals in Mayford, which will increase the risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate entity from Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB9	Object to proposals in Mayford, which will increase the risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate entity from Woking.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB14	Object to proposals in Mayford, which will increase the risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford. No consideration given to preserving Mayford as a separate	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				entity from Woking.			
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	It is unfair for one area to bear the burden of this large scale development. The primary reason appears to be ownership status of the land which shouldn't have any implication.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations. 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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	It is unfair for one area to bear the burden of this large scale development. The primary reason appears to be ownership status of the land which shouldn't have any implication.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations. 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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB7	Woking's Traveller sites are focused in this part of the Borough. Mayford already makes a major contribution. 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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB7	The business secretary Sajid Javid recently stated that the Green Belt can be protected and there is plenty of suitable land elsewhere without the need to build on GB.	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, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB8	The business secretary Sajid Javid recently stated that the Green Belt can be protected and there is plenty of suitable land elsewhere without the need to build on GB.	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, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB9	The business secretary Sajid Javid recently stated that the Green Belt can be protected and there is plenty of suitable land elsewhere without the need to build on GB.	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, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	The business secretary Sajid Javid recently stated that the Green Belt can be protected and there is plenty of suitable land elsewhere without the need to build on GB.	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, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	The business secretary Sajid Javid recently stated that the Green Belt can be protected and there is plenty of suitable land elsewhere without the need to build on GB.	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, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB14	The business secretary Sajid Javid recently stated that the Green Belt can be protected and there is plenty of suitable land elsewhere without the need to build on GB.	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, Section 9.0, Section 11.0 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB7	Historically, planning inspectors have refused applications on this site as it would reduce the openness of a 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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB7	The GB performs an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals will lead to coalescence	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
423	Marie	Stuart	GB8	The GB performs an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals will lead to coalescence	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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB9	The GB performs an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals will lead to coalescence	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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	The GB performs an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals will lead to coalescence	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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	The GB performs an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals will lead to coalescence	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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB14	The GB performs an important function in maintaining a physical separation between Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Proposals will lead to coalescence	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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB7	Object to proposals for the Mayford area. Proposals will have a major, irreversible impact on the character of the village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB8	Object to proposals for the Mayford area. Proposals will have a major, irreversible impact on the character of the village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB9	Object to proposals for the Mayford area. Proposals will have a major, irreversible impact on the character of the village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	Object to proposals for the Mayford area. Proposals will have a major, irreversible impact on the character of the village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	Object to proposals for the Mayford area. Proposals will have a major, irreversible impact on the character of the village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB14	Object to proposals for the Mayford area. Proposals will have a major, irreversible impact on the character of the village which is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB8	Proposals will put strain on the existing strained road network and public transport system	None stated.	This representation 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
						Concerns about public transport are 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.	of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB9	Proposals will put strain on the existing strained road network and public transport system	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Concerns about public transport are 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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB14	Proposals will put strain on the existing strained road network and public transport system	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Concerns about public transport are 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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB7	It is a disproportional burden to develop 550 homes, school and leisure centre in an area of less than 1000 houses at the present.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB8	It is a disproportional burden to develop 550 homes, school and leisure centre in an area of less than 1000 houses at the present.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB9	It is a disproportional burden to develop 550 homes, school and leisure centre in an area of less than 1000 houses at the present.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	It is a disproportional burden to develop 550 homes, school and leisure centre in an area of less than 1000 houses at the present.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	It is a disproportional burden to develop 550 homes, school and leisure centre in an area of less than 1000 houses at the present.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB14	It is a disproportional burden to develop 550 homes, school and leisure centre in an area of less than 1000 houses at the present.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	<p>The proposal for almost 400 homes in an area of under 150 existing is unsustainable and will completely overwhelm the area.</p> <p>There is no public transport, the road infrastructure is poor. The proposed additional households will place a strain on the existing strained network- where it can take up to 40 minutes to get to the town centre.</p> <p>Worplesdon Station is at capacity and access by foot to the station is poor and dangerous.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The 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 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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	<p>The proposal for almost 400 homes in an area of under 150 existing is unsustainable and will completely overwhelm the area.</p> <p>There is no public transport, the road infrastructure is poor. The proposed additional households will place a strain on the existing strained network- where it can take up to 40 minutes</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11 and Section 24.0. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p>	No further modification is 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 get to the town centre. Worplesdon Station is at capacity and access by foot to the station is poor and dangerous.		<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 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>	
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	The area has an important unspoilt lancape character and includes areas of escarpment and rising ground, an important lancape feature.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	The area has an important unspoilt lancape character and includes areas of escarpment and rising ground, an important lancape feature.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct lancape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable lancape features.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	Residents have chosen to live in Mayford for its semi-rural nature. Proposals will have an adverse affect on this.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution and requires development to be built to high design standards.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and 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
						<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>Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	Residents have chosen to live in Mayford for its semi-rural nature. Proposals will have an adverse affect on this.	None stated.	<p>The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment through air/light/noise/water pollution and requires development to be built to high design standards.</p> <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>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
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	The wealth of wildlife in the area will be destroyed. Proposals to provide a wildlife corridor is insincere as proposals would drive away existing wildlife in the area	None stated.	<p>Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	The wealth of wildlife in the area will be destroyed. Proposals to provide a wildlife corridor is insincere as proposals would drive away existing wildlife in the area	None stated.	<p>Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Lancape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the lancape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB8	The proposed school and leisure centre. The rep raises various concerns about light pollution, noise pollution as a result of the proposal.	None stated.	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including any potential impact on local amenity including through light pollution and operating hours of the proposal. The Officer report is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB9	The proposed school and leisure centre. The rep raises various concerns about light pollution, noise pollution as a result of the proposal.	None stated.	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including any potential impact on local amenity including through light pollution and operating hours of the proposal. The Officer report is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB14	The proposed school and leisure centre. The rep raises various concerns about light pollution, noise pollution as a result of the proposal.	None stated.	The planning application for the school has been granted permission. The proposal has been comprehensively assessed including any potential impact on local amenity including through light pollution and operating hours of the proposal. The Officer report is available online	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
423	Marie	Stuart	GB10	The Local Centre comprises a post office and barbershop. There is no other supporting infrastructure e.g. doctors, dentist, grocery store	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore 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>	
423	Marie	Stuart	GB11	The Local Centre comprises a post office and barbershop. There is no other supporting infrastructure e.g. doctors, dentist, grocery store	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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 Lancape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on lancape grounds. The Lancape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	The variety and scale of leisure uses alongside the school will have an immense adverse effect on the area. The proposed operating hours, in the evenings and at weekends, will detriment those living in the vicinity. Raises light and noise pollution issues, at a point when many councils are taking steps to reduce light pollution. There would also be an increase in traffic on already overloaded roads.	None stated.	On impacts from noise and light, The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact from light and noise pollution. Furthermore the emerging Development Management Policies DPD (due for examination in May 2016) contains a detailed policy on noise and light (Policy DM7). With regard to traffic, this representation 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Green Belt land is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, but only classified as 'important' in the Green Belt Review.	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Green Belt land is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, but only classified as 'important' in the Green Belt Review.	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Green Belt land is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, but only classified as 'important' in the Green Belt Review.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Green Belt land is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, but only classified as 'important' in the Green Belt Review.	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Green Belt land is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford, but only classified as 'important' in the Green Belt Review.	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Strongly objects to the proposal for housing on the site.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Strongly objects to the proposal for housing on the site.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Strongly objects to the proposal for housing on the site.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Strongly objects to the proposal for housing on the site.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Strongly objects to the proposal for housing on the site.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford for development is a 7 minute travel time using Google maps. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				doubts the validity of there being no other sites across the whole Borough that are identified or suitable.			
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Lancaple 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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow roads, three single line bridges, most roads are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	The construction of this scale of houses, from about 140 at present, must change the character of the area profoundly.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as	No further modification is 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 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.	
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	The construction of this scale of houses, from about 140 at present, must change the character of the area profoundly.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	The construction of this scale of houses, from about 140 at present, must change the character of the area profoundly.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	The construction of this scale of houses, from about 140 at present, must change the character of the area profoundly.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	The construction of this scale of houses, from about 140 at present, must change the character of the area profoundly.	None stated.	Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through	No further modification is 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 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 toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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 toward 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions toward 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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 toward providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions toward 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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB7	Objects to the proposal to increase the number of Travellers pitches. 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Such housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of Mayford and turning it into a suburb of Woking. It will also increase the risk of merging Woking and Guildford - the whole purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Such housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of Mayford and turning it into a suburb of Woking. It will also increase the risk of merging Woking and Guildford - the whole purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Such housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of Mayford and turning it into a suburb of Woking. It will also increase the risk of merging Woking and Guildford - the whole purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Such housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of Mayford and turning it into a suburb of Woking. It will also increase the risk of merging Woking and Guildford - the whole purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Such housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of Mayford and turning it into a suburb of Woking. It will also increase the risk of merging Woking and Guildford - the whole purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	The areas defined are unsuitable for large numbers of housing for many reasons including increased flood risk with the destruction of water absorbing fiels, which reduces run off from the escarpment. Development 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 3.0 (regarding road structure - paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) and 5.0 on flooding.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	The areas defined are unsuitable for large numbers of housing for many reasons including increased flood risk with the destruction of water absorbing fiels, which reduces run off from the escarpment. Development 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 3.0 (regarding road structure - paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) and 5.0 on flooding.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	The areas defined are unsuitable for large numbers of housing for many reasons including increased flood risk with the destruction of water absorbing fiels, which reduces run off from the escarpment. Development 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 3.0 (regarding road structure - paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) and 5.0 on flooding.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	The areas defined are unsuitable for large numbers of housing for many reasons including increased flood risk with the destruction of water absorbing fiels, which reduces run off from the escarpment. Development 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 3.0 (regarding road structure - paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) and 5.0 on flooding.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	The areas defined are unsuitable for large numbers of housing for many reasons including increased flood risk with	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 (regarding road structure - paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11) and 5.0 on flooding.	No further modification is 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 destruction of water absorbing fiel, which reduces run off from the escarpment. Development will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.			of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	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 fiel either side 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
512	Alan	Stuart	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 fiel either side 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
512	Alan	Stuart	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 fiel either side later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on either side 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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	There appears to have been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly on roads and traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				There are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as increased traffic to the station will be weaving around pedestrians, as there are no pavements.		The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	There appears to have been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly on roads and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as increased traffic to the station will be weaving around pedestrians, as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	There appears to have been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly on roads and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as increased traffic to the station will be weaving around pedestrians, as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	There appears to have been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly on roads and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as increased traffic to the station will be weaving around pedestrians, as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	There appears to have been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly on roads and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade roads or railway bridges or robust solutions to deal with existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become very dangerous as increased traffic to the station will be weaving around pedestrians, as there are no pavements.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	There are only two miles between Mayford and Slyfield resulting in a high risk of coalescence should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	There are only two miles between Mayford and Slyfield resulting in a high risk of coalescence should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	There are only two miles between Mayford and Slyfield resulting in a high risk of coalescence should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	There are only two miles between Mayford and Slyfield resulting in a high risk of coalescence should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	There are only two miles between Mayford and Slyfield resulting in a high risk of coalescence should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	Objections are based on the following crucial factors: - national policy states the Green Belt should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances', which has not been proved by the Council, particularly in light of the fact that 'housing need -including for 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	Objections are based on the following crucial factors: - national policy states the Green Belt should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances', which has not been proved by the Council, particularly in light of the fact that 'housing need -including for Traveller sites -does not justify harm done to	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				the Green Belt by inappropriate development.'			
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	Objections are based on the following crucial factors: - national policy states the Green Belt should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances', which has not been proved by the Council, particularly in light of the fact that 'housing need -including for 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	Objections are based on the following crucial factors: - national policy states the Green Belt should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances', which has not been proved by the Council, particularly in light of the fact that 'housing need -including for 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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Objections are based on the following crucial factors: - national policy states the Green Belt should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances', which has not been proved by the Council, particularly in light of the fact that 'housing need -including for 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
512	Alan	Stuart	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 lancape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB7	The site does not have safe and reasonable access to schools or other local facilities.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	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, lancape 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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or	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
				not.			
512	Alan	Stuart	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	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
512	Alan	Stuart	GB14	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
519	John	Stuart	GB4	The area is already subject to flooding, which will be worsened with any development on the flood plain.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
519	John	Stuart	GB5	The area is already subject to flooding, which will be worsened with any development on the flood plain.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
519	John	Stuart	GB4	This development is on Green Belt land when brownfield land appears to have been ignored.	None stated.	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 between 2022 and 2027 in order to comprehensively deliver the Core Strategy. The Council has considered a number of sites in the urban area (brownfield land/previously developed land). This is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
519	John	Stuart	GB5	This development is on Green Belt land when brownfield land appears to have been ignored.	None stated.	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 between 2022 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
						2027 in order to comprehensively deliver the Core Strategy. The Council has considered a number of sites in the urban area (brownfield land/previously developed land). This is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	
519	John	Stuart	GB4	Objects to the plans to release Green Belt land for development, as infrastructure would need a major upgrade to support any development. This includes drainage, foul and surface water and roads. The main road system linking the village to major highways is already often gridlocked without the possibility of improvement.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
519	John	Stuart	GB5	Objects to the plans to release Green Belt land for development, as infrastructure would need a major upgrade to support any development. This includes drainage, foul and surface water and roads. The main road system linking the village to major highways is already often gridlocked without the possibility of improvement.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraphs 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1435	Philip	Stubbs	GB18	During discussions on the planning application for Brookwood Farm, we were led to believe that all old farm land to the west, south and east of the proposed development would be protected and included in a new Country Park. The proposal here is to limit the size of the SANG to land to the west of the new development. Would be grateful for clarification of the status of land formerly part of Brookwood Farm, that is not currently being developed, but is outside the SANG/	The SANG as outlined in GB18 should include all the remaining land on the Brookwood Farm site that is not part of the agreed Brookwood Farm development or land set aside for a new school.	The areas referred to would be protected as Green Belt land and, for certain areas, their designation as Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and Ancient Woodland. It should be noted that any development (even for a country park) on land designated as Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area would need to be considered acceptable in terms of its wildlife sensitivity, with regard to the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation, and CS8; Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
264	Sheila	Sullivan	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS20: Heritage and Conservation. This seeks to protect Areas of High Archaeological Potential from harmful development and requires an archaeological evaluation and investigation for development proposals on sites greater than 0.4 ha. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM20: Heritage Assets and their settings. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. The County Archaeologist has also provided comments on the proposal sites (see Rep ID 1240). These will also be taken into consideration. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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	No further modification is 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 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>	
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	GB8	Concerned about loss of green field 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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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
264	Sheila	Sullivan	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1176	Vicki	Sullivan	GB12	Over 400 new houses and 800+ cars on local roads will mean gridlock. Coldharbour Road already has a significant problem, especially in term time. There are accidents and near misses, risks to pedestrians is will increase dramatically.	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
1176	Vicki	Sullivan	GB13	Over 400 new houses and 800+ cars on local roads will mean gridlock. Coldharbour Road already has a significant problem, especially in term time. There are accidents and near misses, risks to pedestrians is will increase dramatically.	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
1176	Vicki	Sullivan	GB12	I am very concerned. We moved here because of the beautiful surroundings and peaceful village atmosphere; this will be destroyed by these housing estates. The local area lacks the infrastructure to support so many new households. The local school is already massively over subscribed, without additional families moving in. The nearest doctor surgery in West Byfleet also lacks capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The 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. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1176	Vicki	Sullivan	GB13	I am very concerned. We moved here because of the beautiful surroundings and peaceful village atmosphere; this will be destroyed by these housing estates. The local area lacks the infrastructure to support so many new households. The local school is already massively over subscribed, without additional families moving in. The nearest doctor surgery in West Byfleet also lacks capacity.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1119		Sumner	GB12	Pyrford Guides and Scouts Association run the Arbor Centre on the corner of one of the fiel. The uniformed groups all meet here and regularly use the field for their outdoor activities. The field is an invaluable and irreplaceable facility for young people.	None stated.	Proposal GB11 deals with this matter. The policy says that the Village Hall and the adjacent recreational uses are included in the allocation to ensure that an enduring defensible boundary of the Green Belt can be drawn, but they are not to be development. The recreational uses on the fiel will not be affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1119		Sumner	GB13	Pyrford Guides and Scouts Association run the Arbor Centre on the corner of one of the fiel. The uniformed groups all meet here and regularly use the field for their outdoor activities. The field is an invaluable and irreplaceable facility for young people.	None stated.	Proposal GB11 deals with this matter. The policy says that the Village Hall and the adjacent recreational uses are included in the allocation to ensure that an enduring defensible boundary of the Green Belt can be drawn, but they are not to be development. The recreational uses on the fiel will not be affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1119		Sumner	GB12	<p>Infrastructure will not support all these new homes. Pyrford is a small village, a few small shops, no health centre, post office or other facilities. People need to travel out of Pyrford in their day to day life, including to the railway station. Station car parks are already at capacity and would worsen.</p> <p>We recognise there is demand for new homes building, however there are better sites to meet these requirements. Just because the land seems available doesn't mean it is a good choice. We urge you not to permit building on this land.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1119		Sumner	GB13	<p>Infrastructure will not support all these new homes. Pyrford is a small village, a few small shops, no health centre, post office or other facilities. People need to travel out of Pyrford in their day to day life, including to the railway station. Station car parks are already at capacity and would worsen.</p> <p>We recognise there is demand for new homes building, however there are better sites to meet these requirements. Just because the land seems available doesn't mean it is a good choice. We urge you not to permit building on this land.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1119		Sumner	GB12	We object to the lack of infrastructure and damage to the natural environment. Pyrford is a village with character and community spirit as it isn't too big or sprawling. This is why we live here. These fiel form part of the Pyrford escarpment with wonderful views, building would blight the beautiful historic lancape. Footpaths and walks are enjoyed by residents and visitors. In January 2015 local residents helped with hedge planting along Sandy Lane; 1300 hedgerow trees as a living memorial to the people of Pyrford who died in the First World War. Very sad that this wonderful memorial may now not grow and flourish.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	
1119		Sumner	GB13	We object to the lack of infrastructure and damage to the natural environment. Pyrford is a village with character and community spirit as it isn't too big or sprawling. This is why we live here. These fields form part of the Pyrford escarpment with wonderful views, building would blight the beautiful historic landscape. Footpaths and walks are enjoyed by residents and visitors. In January 2015 local residents helped with hedge planting along Sandy Lane; 1300 hedgerow trees as a living memorial to the people of Pyrford who died in the First World War. Very sad that this wonderful memorial may now not grow and flourish.	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
1119		Sumner	GB12	We walk to school daily; traffic along Coldharbour Road is already extremely dangerous. Cars regularly mount the kerb when drivers become frustrated with school traffic. More homes would increase traffic.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1119		Sumner	GB13	We walk to school daily; traffic along Coldharbour Road is already extremely dangerous. Cars regularly mount the kerb when drivers become frustrated with school traffic. More homes would increase traffic.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB12	Pyrford school is rebuilding but not expanding. The likely population increase will generate further demand for places, it does not appear to be a joined up approach.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB13	Pyrford school is rebuilding but not expanding. The likely population increase will generate further demand for places, it does not appear to be a joined up approach.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB12	Concerned about the impact on infrastructure including schools, traffic and amenities. Traffic is already gridlocked and the primary school is at capacity.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
737	V	Sutherland	GB13	Concerned about the impact on infrastructure including schools, traffic and amenities. Traffic is already gridlocked and the primary school is at capacity.	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
737	V	Sutherland	GB12	WBC has not followed the correct governance and process. It has ignored the views of both the local community and the GBBR. There needs to be more transparency and consultation and WBC must listen to these important stakeholders. Trust this will result in a rethink of the proposals.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and Section 17.0 In following the prescribed consultation requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Council will be undertaking a further public consultation in due course (Regulation 19). Following this there will be an Examination in Public where local stakeholders and the community will be able to express their views on the Site Allocations DPD if they feel that they have been ignored. In following the relevant regulations the Council is satisfied that the correct process has and will continue to be followed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB13	WBC has not followed the correct governance and process. It has ignored the views of both the local community and the GBBR. There needs to be more transparency and consultation and WBC must listen to these important stakeholders. Trust this will result in a rethink of the proposals.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0 and Section 17.0 In following the prescribed consultation requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Council will be undertaking a further public consultation in due course (Regulation 19). Following this there will be an Examination in Public where local stakeholders and the community will be able to express their views on the Site Allocations DPD if they feel that they have been ignored. In following the relevant regulations the Council is satisfied that the correct process has and will continue to be followed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB12	House building outside of the borough in neighbouring areas may also have an impact on infrastructure, including traffic.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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, including proposed developments inside 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
737	V	Sutherland	GB13	House building outside of the borough in neighbouring areas may also have an impact on infrastructure, including traffic.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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.	No further modification is 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, including proposed developments inside 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.	
737	V	Sutherland	GB12	Appreciate the need for housing but it is inappropriate in this area. Alternative options should be considered, some of which have already been proposed by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	The Council has commissioned and published a comprehensive review of the Green Belt in Woking Borough. In addition to this, it has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal assessing 125 sites against sustainability objectives. More information regarding the alternative sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0. Nevertheless, as part of the Regulation 18 consultation on the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is considering all alternative sites put forward by land owners, developers and the public. These sites will be considered before the DPD is published for Regulation 19 consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB13	Appreciate the need for housing but it is inappropriate in this area. Alternative options should be considered, some of which have already been proposed by the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.	None stated.	The Council has commissioned and published a comprehensive review of the Green Belt in Woking Borough. In addition to this, it has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal assessing 125 sites against sustainability objectives. More information regarding the alternative sites has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0. Nevertheless, as part of the Regulation 18 consultation on the Site Allocations DPD, the Council is considering all alternative sites put forward by land owners, developers and the public. These sites will be considered before the DPD is published for Regulation 19 consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account. WBC have departed from the recommendations of the GBBR.	None stated.	As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
737	V	Sutherland	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The views of Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum have not been taken into account. WBC have departed from the recommendations of the GBBR.	None stated.	As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19. The representation regarding the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB12	Woking has a number of brownfield sites that can be used for development, these should be used rather than the proposed sites. Once development takes place, the Green Belt is lost forever and Pyrford will never be the same again.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD sets out over 50 sites in the existing urban area that is suitable for redevelopment. The process of identifying these sites as well as reusing vacant buildings is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of Pyrford is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB13	Woking has a number of brownfield sites that can be used for development, these should be used rather than the proposed sites. Once development takes place, the Green Belt is lost forever and Pyrford will never be the same again.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD sets out over 50 sites in the existing urban area that is suitable for redevelopment. The process of identifying these sites as well as reusing vacant buildings is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of Pyrford is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
819	Gary	Sutton	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Maintain the character of Pyrford including community, countryside, footpaths and historic assets	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Maintain the character of Pyrford including community, countryside, footpaths and historic assets	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB12	Increasing flood risk and the impact on water and sewage systems	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB13	Increasing flood risk and the impact on water and sewage systems	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB12	Additional pressure on the road network which is dangerous outside of the school and nurseries.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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 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
819	Gary	Sutton	GB13	Additional pressure on the road network which is dangerous outside of the school and nurseries.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</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. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
819	Gary	Sutton	GB12	Pressure on local infrastructure	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD proposes specialist accommodation within some of the proposed sites as well as a significant amount of retail floor space within a number of the local centres and town centre. This is supported within Core Strategy CS1 and CS13.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB13	Pressure on local infrastructure	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD proposes specialist accommodation within some of the proposed sites as well as a significant amount of retail floor space within a number of the local centres and town centre. This is supported within Core Strategy CS1 and CS13.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB12	The area is used for recreational purposes and scenic areas such as this are becoming fewer.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
819	Gary	Sutton	GB13	The area is used for recreational purposes and scenic areas such as this are becoming fewer.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB12	Woking has a number of brownfield sites that can be used for development, these should be used rather than the proposed sites. Once development takes place, the Green	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD sets out over 50 sites in the existing urban area that is suitable for redevelopment. The process of identifying these sites as well as reusing vacant buildings is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Belt is lost forever and Pyrford will never be the same again.		The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of Pyrford is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB13	Woking has a number of brownfield sites that can be used for development, these should be used rather than the proposed sites. Once development takes place, the Green Belt is lost forever and Pyrford will never be the same again.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD sets out over 50 sites in the existing urban area that is suitable for redevelopment. The process of identifying these sites as well as reusing vacant buildings is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and 16.0. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of Pyrford is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Maintain the character of Pyrford including community, countryside, footpaths and historic assets	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. Maintain the character of Pyrford including community, countryside, footpaths and historic assets	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB12	Increasing flood risk and the impact on water and sewage systems	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB13	Increasing flood risk and the impact on water and sewage systems	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0 and Section 3.0, paragraph 3.9 and 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB12	Additional pressure on the road network which is dangerous outside of the school and nurseries.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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 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
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB13	Additional pressure on the road network which is dangerous outside of the school and nurseries.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB12	Pressure on local infrastructure	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD proposes specialist accommodation within some of the proposed sites as well as a significant amount of retail floor space within a number of the local centres and town centre. This is supported within Core Strategy CS1 and CS13.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB13	Pressure on local infrastructure	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Site Allocations DPD proposes specialist accommodation within some of the proposed sites as well as a significant amount of retail floor space within a number of the local centres and town centre. This is supported within Core Strategy CS1 and CS13.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB12	The area is used for recreational purposes and scenic areas such as this are becoming fewer.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
820	Natalie	Sutton	GB13	The area is used for recreational purposes and scenic areas such as this are becoming fewer.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding lancape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council accepts that any land taken out of the Green Belt will lead to a reduction of the amount of Green Belt land and the benefits it brings to the particular communities where the land is situated. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total</p>	No further modification is 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 Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development needs up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	
533	Maureen	Swains	GB12	Objects to the release of Green Belt land either side of Upshot Lane, due to the impact of extra traffic on narrow local roads, which are already busy especially at peak times, with workers, school children and people accessing the A3 and M25.	None stated.	This representation 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
533	Maureen	Swains	GB13	Objects to the release of Green Belt land either side of Upshot Lane, due to the impact of extra traffic on narrow local roads, which are already busy especially at peak times, with workers, school children and people accessing the A3 and M25.	None stated.	This representation 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
533	Maureen	Swains	GB12	RHS Wisley will suffer from the fumes and noise from extra traffic. Have they been considered or consulted?	Please reconsider this site as appropriate.	RHS Wisley have not been directly approached for their opinion. However, the Council is working with Guildford Borough Council, the Highways Authority (at Surrey County Council) and the Highways Agency to address cross boundary traffic issues, particularly regarding access to the A3. The Council's approach to traffic and transport issues is further addressed in Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
533	Maureen	Swains	GB13	RHS Wisley will suffer from the fumes and noise from extra traffic. Have they been considered or consulted?	Please reconsider this site as appropriate.	RHS Wisley have not been directly approached for their opinion. However, the Council is working with Guildford Borough Council, the Highways Authority (at Surrey County Council) and the Highways Agency to address cross boundary traffic issues, particularly regarding access to the A3. The Council's approach to traffic and transport issues is further addressed in Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB12	Inadequate infrastructure to cope with the dramatic increase in population.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB13	Inadequate infrastructure to cope with the dramatic increase in population.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB12	Proposals will ruin the heritage of the tranquil English village	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB13	Proposals will ruin the heritage of the tranquil English village	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB12	Object to the release of GB in Pyrford, the proposals are contrary to the stated purpose of GB land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB13	Object to the release of GB in Pyrford, the proposals are contrary to the stated purpose of GB land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, particularly paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB12	Understands housing targets need to be met however believes further work should be carried out to find alternative sites	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1254	Christopher, Caroline	Symington	GB13	Understands housing targets need to be met however believes further work should be carried out to find alternative sites	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
829	G	Syrett	General	Objecting to release Green Belt land in Byfleet and surrounding areas. The petition against building in the Green Belt 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
829	G	Syrett	General	If all other alternatives are exhausted, Green Belt development should be spread evenly across the borough and not concentrated in one area.	None stated.	The response regarding the release of Green Belt for residential development has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation 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>	
829	G	Syrett	GB15	Local roads are already inadequate and confirmed by SCC Strategic Transport Assessment. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. Bus services have been reduced.	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 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> <p>The frequency of the local 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
829	G	Syrett	GB16	Local roads are already inadequate and confirmed by SCC Strategic Transport Assessment. The A245 is gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse. Bus services have been reduced.	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> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>The frequency of the local 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.</p>	
829	G	Syrett	GB4	Local infrastructure is under strain, including medical facilities and drainage and sewage systems. Much of Byfleet and the proposed development area has already flooded or is in danger of flooding. These concerns have to be addressed before any future development.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.</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 representation regarding flooding has been 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
829	G	Syrett	GB5	Local infrastructure is under strain, including medical facilities and drainage and sewage systems. Much of Byfleet and the proposed development area has already flooded or is in danger of flooding. These concerns have to be addressed before any future development.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraphs 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.</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 representation regarding flooding has been 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
829	G	Syrett	General	Objects to release of Green Belt land. It should be preserved and only used for development once all other sites have been exhausted. No independent review of brownfield sites has been carried out, contrary to government policy	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