

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
406	Ben	Tancell	General	General objection to the DPD	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
406	Ben	Tancell	General	General objection to the SA which supports the DPD	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
406	Ben	Tancell	General	General objection to the HRA which supports the DPD	None stated.	Objection noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
863	Peter	Tapp	General	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
863	Peter	Tapp	General	Objecting	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
863	Peter	Tapp	UA28	More traffic and houses will be overlooked and loss of privacy. Other sites must be available that don't take peoples gardens.	There must be other sites available without taking people's gardens who have children playing safely in them.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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> <p>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 overlooking and privacy.</p> <p>The Council notes the proposed modification and sympathises with the concern. The Council has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of the borough. As part of this assessment it highlighted that this site was granted planning permission in 2006 (PLAN/2006/0387). As the site has outline planning permission, is located in a sustainable location close to services and facilities and within the existing urban area, the Council believe that it is suitable for development. Nevertheless the details regarding amenity space and design will need to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council has a robust policy framework to ensure that new development achieves a satisfactory relationship with adjacent buildings and that residential amenity is protected.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 - asks why no other sites across the whole Borough have been identified as suitable?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 4.0, 9.0 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. What justification is there 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review, the main justification for decisions, was not consulted on and was flawed. Flaws include that sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review, the main justification for decisions, was not consulted on and was flawed. Flaws include that sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review, the main justification for decisions, was not consulted on and was flawed. Flaws include that sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 high density 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 high density 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 high density 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 high density 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	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 high density 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	Objects due to the proposals meaning urban sprawl will be increased, between Hook Heath and Mayford, and Mayford and Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent it and maintain open spaces between towns and villages	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	Objects due to the proposals meaning urban sprawl will be increased, between Hook Heath and Mayford, and Mayford and Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent it and maintain open spaces between towns and villages	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	Objects due to the proposals meaning urban sprawl will be increased, between Hook Heath and Mayford, and Mayford and Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent it and maintain open spaces between towns and villages	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB7	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review is flawed as is claimed these sites were 'sustainable' on the basis on Google travel times, taken outside rush hour and hence hopelessly optimistic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review is flawed as is claimed these sites were 'sustainable' on the basis on Google travel times, taken outside rush hour and hence hopelessly optimistic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review is flawed as is claimed these sites were 'sustainable' on the basis on Google travel times, taken outside rush hour and hence hopelessly optimistic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				at peak times.		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.	
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB7	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	The removal of GB14 from the Green Belt to create 'green infrastructure' is unnecessary as not change of use is planned. In any case it is not an 'exceptional circumstance to remove land from the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>This is acknowledged. While exceptional circumstances apply to other sites in Mayford and Hook Heath for their release from Green Belt for development (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12) this site is proposed for release to ensure clear and logical Green Belt boundary is drawn (as per NPPF paragraph 85), with regard to its position between sites GB8 and GB10, rather than a need for its release to accommodate development. As outlined in the allocation (and representation) the site would be protected for Green Infrastructure.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p>	No further modification is 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.	
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	The average density of housing proposed (30 dph) is incompatible with surrounding densities, of 5.5 dph in Hook Heath and less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	The average density of housing proposed (30 dph) is incompatible with surrounding densities, of 5.5 dph in Hook Heath and less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	Transport infrastructure will be overloaded. It, particularly Egley Road is already congested at rush hours and the proposals will worsen this with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	Transport infrastructure will be overloaded. It, particularly Egley Road is already congested at rush hours and the proposals will worsen this with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	Transport infrastructure will be overloaded. It, particularly Egley Road is already congested at rush hours and the proposals will worsen this with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need. WBC should be arguing the Green Belt is important and resisting requirements to build on this land.	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need. WBC should be arguing the Green Belt is important and resisting requirements to build on this land.	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need. WBC should be arguing the Green Belt is important and resisting requirements to build on this land.	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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a	None stated.	This representation 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
				major increase in congestion.			
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for intended occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Traveller related business activities would be out of keeping in such a road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities - the site does not.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the vista; amenity and character of the area. 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.	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character, landscape and amenity of the immediate area are minimised and/ or suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. In addition, the Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 any of 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	No further modification is 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 enhance the currently rather dispersed provision in the Mayford area, and better meet the day to day needs of local people.	
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB10	WBC have ignored their own previously agreed strategy in terms of Core Strategy CS24 and that development should positively benefit, conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character, local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas. The policy includes key landscapes, escarpments and locally valued features.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB11	WBC have ignored their own previously agreed strategy in terms of Core Strategy CS24 and that development should positively benefit, conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character, local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas. The policy includes key landscapes, escarpments and locally valued features.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	GB14	WBC have ignored their own previously agreed strategy in terms of Core Strategy CS24 and that development should positively benefit, conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character, local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas. The policy includes key landscapes, escarpments and locally valued features.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 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
1470	Sue	Tasker	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 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 - asks why no other sites across the whole Borough have been identified as suitable?	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. What justification is there 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review, the main justification for decisions, was not consulted on and was flawed. Flaws include that sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity 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)'.	No further modification is 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.	
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review, the main justification for decisions, was not consulted on and was flawed. Flaws include that sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review, the main justification for decisions, was not consulted on and was flawed. Flaws include that sites were recommended on the basis of proximity to a 'Local Centre'. Other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure e.g. shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities or schools. Residents of new development would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relatively small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 high density 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 high density 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 high density 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 high density 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of high density between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.			of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	Objects due to the proposals meaning urban sprawl will be increased, between Hook Heath and Mayford, and Mayford and Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent it and maintain open spaces between towns and villages	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	Objects due to the proposals meaning urban sprawl will be increased, between Hook Heath and Mayford, and Mayford and Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent it and maintain open spaces between towns and villages	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	Objects due to the proposals meaning urban sprawl will be increased, between Hook Heath and Mayford, and Mayford and Woking, contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent it and maintain open spaces between towns and villages	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0. Justification for the release of Green Belt land and for safeguarding sites for future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB7	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	Feels strongly about these proposals and would like to know how WBC expects to fund all of this development?	None stated.	Developers (or the investors behind them) will, on the whole, fund development. This document seeks to identify sites for the delivery of development, and provide guidance for such development (alongside other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance, and National Planning Policy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review is flawed as is claimed these sites were 'sustainable' on the basis on Google travel times, taken outside rush hour and hence hopelessly optimistic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review is flawed as is claimed these sites were 'sustainable' on the basis on Google travel times, taken outside rush hour and hence hopelessly optimistic.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review is flawed as is claimed these sites were 'sustainable' on the basis on Google travel times, taken	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				outside rush hour and hence hopelessly optimistic.		services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. This representation has been further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.			
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review's basis for recommending Mayford is the ease of access to the town centre, stating it takes 7 minutes to travel. This was estimated using Google maps, and does not reflect the actual travel time of over half at hour at peak times.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	Mayford is a rural farming area with a poor road network. Roads are narrow and unlit with few pedestrian footpaths. Existing traffic at peak hours will be adversely affected by homes being built at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, and the proposed school with worsen it 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. 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB7	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	<p>This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	The removal of GB14 from the Green Belt to create 'green infrastructure' is unnecessary as not change of use is planned. In any case it is not an 'exceptional circumstance to remove land from the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>This is acknowledged. While exceptional circumstances apply to other sites in Mayford and Hook Heath for their release from Green Belt for development (see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12) this site is proposed for release to ensure clear and logical Green Belt boundary is drawn (as per NPPF paragraph 85), with regard to its position between sites GB8 and GB10, rather than a need for its release to accommodate development. As outlined in the allocation (and representation) the site would be protected for Green Infrastructure.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	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.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and why areas of landscape importance are ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The average density of housing proposed (30 dph) is incompatible with surrounding densities, of 5.5 dph in Hook Heath and less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	The average density of housing proposed (30 dph) is incompatible with surrounding densities, of 5.5 dph in Hook Heath and less in Fishers Hill Conservation Area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	Transport infrastructure will be overloaded. It, particularly Egley Road is already congested at rush hours and the proposals will worsen this with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	Transport infrastructure will be overloaded. It, particularly Egley Road is already congested at rush hours and the proposals will worsen this with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	Transport infrastructure will be overloaded. It, particularly Egley Road is already congested at rush hours and the proposals will worsen this with additional traffic.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need. WBC should be arguing the Green Belt is important and resisting requirements to build on this land.	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need. WBC should be arguing the Green Belt is important and resisting requirements to build on this land.	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	National planning policy allows the release of land from the Green Belt only in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for 1200 houses on these sites. While the Core Strategy requires the Council to deliver 550 new homes between 2022 and 2027, WBC has gone further than required by identifying sites for an additional 1200 homes, where there is no demonstrated exceptional need. WBC should be arguing the Green Belt is important and resisting requirements to build on this land.	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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	There are three single light bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. These could not handle additional traffic, and include the route to Worplesdon station. There would be a major increase in 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites should have adequate amenity for intended occupiers, including space for related business activities. Smarts Heath Road is a residential road with two Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Traveller related business activities would be out of keeping in such a road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. However, any proposal should take into account the traditional way of life of Travellers. This matter has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic paper and the DPD will clarify this issue. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of	No further modification is 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 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.	
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities - the site does not.	None stated.	It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB7	Traveller sites should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the vista; amenity and character of the area. 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.	None stated.	There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character, landscape and amenity of the immediate area are minimised and/ or suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. In addition, the Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 any of 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB10	WBC have ignored their own previously agreed strategy in terms of Core Strategy CS24 and that development should positively benefit, conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character, local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas. The policy includes key landscapes, escarpments and locally valued features.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB11	WBC have ignored their own previously agreed strategy in terms of Core Strategy CS24 and that development should positively benefit, conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character, local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas. The policy includes key landscapes, escarpments and locally valued features.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1472	Peter	Tasker	GB14	WBC have ignored their own previously agreed strategy in terms of Core Strategy CS24 and that development should positively benefit, conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character, local distinctiveness and have regard to landscape character areas. The policy includes key landscapes, escarpments and locally valued features.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 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
1472	Peter	Tasker	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 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
1161	John Keith	Tatlock	GB4	The Green Belt should be preserved not nibbled away. Parvis Road is already heavily congested at peak times and will be unusable. Infrastructure will become overloaded. Flood risk will increase. This site is one of the last green lungs for the village.	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 infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Section 3. The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1161	John Keith	Tatlock	GB5	The Green Belt should be preserved not nibbled away. Parvis Road is already heavily congested at peak times and will be unusable. Infrastructure will become overloaded. Flood risk will increase. This site is one of the last green lungs for the village.	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 traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. The Council will work with the Council to ensure the development impacts are appropriately mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1161	John Keith	Tatlock	8 Likely situation without the Site Allocations DPD	Proposals for sites GB4 and GB5 contradict many of the aims and intentions of this part of the draft sustainability appraisal report.	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 supports the selection of the sites 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 contraction between the appraisal and its conclusions.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
265	Iain	Taylor	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	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
265	Iain	Taylor	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a 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.	
265	Iain	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
266	Pat	Taylor	GB8	Objects to removal of land from Green Belt	Don't remove land from the	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	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
					Green Belt	Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0	of this representation
266	Pat	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	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
266	Pat	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Grade Two listed buildings, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common to open countryside.	stated.		
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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>	
556	Geoffrey	Taylor	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.	<p>All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1567	Patricia H	Taylor	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <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
1567	Patricia H	Taylor	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council 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>	
1567	Patricia H	Taylor	GB12	Pyrford is attractive because the properties are well spaced and cared for. Development at this scale would be a huge blot on the landscape.	None stated.	<p>The Council has a number of policies and best practice guidance in place to ensure that new development provides a positive contribution to local character, including local townscape and landscape. This is set out within the Core Strategy, Policy CS21, the Design SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD. The character of Pyrford is well documented and is set out within the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. Through the policy framework and the key requirements set out in the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believes that future development will not have a negative impact on local character or landscape.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1567	Patricia H	Taylor	GB13	Pyrford is attractive because the properties are well spaced and cared for. Development at this scale would be a huge blot on the landscape.	None stated.	<p>The Council has a number of policies and best practice guidance in place to ensure that new development provides a positive contribution to local character, including local townscape and landscape. This is set out within the Core Strategy, Policy CS21, the Design SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD. The character of Pyrford is well documented and is set out within the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. Through the policy framework and the key requirements set out in the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believes that future development will not have a negative impact on local character or landscape.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1587	Audrey	Taylor	General	Congestion should be addressed and the need for more medical and educational facilities. The roads, and future development, will flood. Too many gardens will be taken to crowd the village with more houses and less facilities. It is already difficult to get out of the village during rush hour.	Those that make the decisions should come to the area in rush hour morning and evening and see the problems that more development would have.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 education provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>The proposed modification is noted. The officers of the Council have attended numerous site visits to the area as well as taken part in meetings with local organisations and groups. The overall decision regarding the Site Allocations DPD will be discussed and agreed at a full Council meeting, which is made up of Councillors from all areas of the Borough.</p>	
1587	Audrey	Taylor	General	Why deprive us and future children of Green Belt space.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.10.</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
1245	Julian	Temple	General	<p>Objection.</p> <p>Refers and supports comments made by Cllr John Bond in his letter dated 27 July (copy attached). Would hope that the views of local Councillors will carry additional weight in decision making.</p> <p>Supports all the points set out in his letter.</p>	None stated.	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The response to the Councillor Bond's representation can be found under Representor ID 299 and Representor ID 1524</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1245	Julian	Temple	General	<p>Understands the various pressures being placed on the borough and problems experienced nationally in terms of housing.</p> <p>Not convinced that development on the GB will address the housing issue.</p> <p>GB dates back 70 years and the main aim is to restrict urban growth and enable communities to maintain open space between neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>GB land has rarely been released for housing schemes and if carried out will set a dangerous precedent.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.9.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1245	Julian	Temple	General	<p>There is widespread concern about infrastructure provision to support proposals. Local residents have concerns about flood risk, infrastructure, traffic congestion, further consideration is needed on these matters and these need to be fully addressed before housing schemes are approved that will overburden the existing community.</p> <p>Affordable accommodation for local people should be chief priority.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB7	<p>Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.</p>	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB8	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access 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
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB9	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access 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
899	Hugh	Thacker	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB8	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB9	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				separate settlement or on the impact on the character of the village.		the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB8	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB9	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB10	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB11	The roads are already at capacity, further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	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. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	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. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out in developed areas. Increased risk to wildlife in nearby protected Heaths.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	<p>The representation on openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p> <p>The representation on 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
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB8	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	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
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB8	No consideration the impact on infrastructure from a larger population. The GBBR incorrectly identifies Mayford with a Local Centre.	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. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	GB9	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including roads, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worplesden Station but there are no pavements.	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. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	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.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
899	Hugh	Thacker	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.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. This representation has also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
418	N K	Theodorou	GB12	Congestion is a significant issue during peak times. The proposals will add a significant amount of extra traffic particularly onto Oakcroft Road.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The	No further modification is proposed 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>	
418	N K	Theodorou	GB13	Congestion is a significant issue during peak times. The proposals will add a significant amount of extra traffic particularly onto Oakcroft Road.	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
418	N K	Theodorou	GB12	Oppose to the development proposals for Upshot Lane. The main purpose of GB is to preserve it for future generations. If development is continually allowed then there will be none left	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
418	N K	Theodorou	GB13	Oppose to the development proposals for Upshot Lane. The main purpose of GB is to preserve it for future generations. If development is continually allowed then there will be none left	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
418	N K	Theodorou	GB13	Understands the need for housing but has there been any consideration of alternatives? Pyrford has a unique character. If development should come forward then consider development in West Byfleet Centre akin to development at the Hart Centre in Walton- it would enhance the character and contribute to housing provision.	Consider redevelopment of Sheer House in West Byfleet Centre to meet the housing need	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 19.0, 23.0, 11.0, 9.0 and Section 7.0</p> <p>In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
418	N K	Theodorou	GB12	Understands the need for housing but has there been any consideration of alternatives? Pyrford has a unique character. If development should come	Consider redevelopment of Sheer	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 23.0, 11.0, 9.0 and 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
				forward then consider development in West Byfleet Centre akin to development at the Hart Centre in Walton- it would enhance the character and contribute to housing provision.	House in West Byfleet Centre to meet the housing need	In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).	
4	Richard	Thomas	General	Object to development on Green Belt.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	General	Question if sufficient education infrastructure is in hand to support the development proposed.	None stated.	It is envisaged that the projected need for education will be met through the provision of a secondary school at site GB8 and expansion of capacity at existing schools. This matter has also been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	GB16	Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford will be grid locked as cannot take the extra traffic. It is unclear what criteria Surrey County Council are working to.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	GB15	Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford will be grid locked as cannot take the extra traffic. It is unclear what criteria Surrey County Council are working to.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.0 and 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	General	The proposals will set a precedent for other Green Belt development in the future and infrastructure provision will be too late or not at all.	None stated.	The Site Allocations DPD is a plan led approach to delivering development in the most suitable and sustainable locations across the Borough. By having an up to date Core Strategy and an adopted Site Allocations DPD, the Council would be in the strongest position to defend the Green Belt from any opportunistic development proposals. One of the aims of the Site Allocations DPD is to create a robust defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure beyond the Plan period. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	GB4	Residents are concerned about local development proposals. There are too many homes planned in this area and would have a negative impact on infrastructure and reduce the amount of Green Belt.	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. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	GB5	Residents are concerned about local development proposals. There are too many homes planned in this area and would have a negative impact on infrastructure and reduce the amount of Green Belt.	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. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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.</p>	
4	Richard	Thomas	GB15	Residents are concerned about local development proposals. There are too many homes planned in this area and would have a negative impact on infrastructure and reduce the amount of Green Belt.	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>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	GB16	Residents are concerned about local development proposals. There are too many homes planned in this area and would have a negative impact on infrastructure and reduce the amount of Green Belt.	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>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	GB12	Residents are concerned about local development proposals. There are too many homes planned in this area and would have a negative impact on infrastructure and reduce the amount of Green Belt.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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.</p>	
4	Richard	Thomas	GB13	Residents are concerned about local development proposals. There are too many homes planned in this area and would have a negative impact on infrastructure and reduce the amount of Green Belt.	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>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	General	<p>The existing infrastructure can not cope and additional development will make the situation worse. This includes education and healthcare provision, drainage and flooding.</p> <p>Concern that residents views will be ignored. Densities are too high.</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. 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 Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding densities has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
4	Richard	Thomas	General	Object to the principle of Green Belt development. The proposed developments are significantly larger than the existing villages. This part of the Borough is doing its fair share with regards to development.	None stated.	<p>Objection noted. The Council's approach to 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.</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 suggests that 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
						<p>proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Core Strategy 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 scale of development is reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities and housing numbers are indicative and can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that less development could require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified housing need.</p>	
4	Richard	Thomas	General	<p>Overwhelming objection locally and demand that these sites are not released for development. If this is ignored, then appropriate infrastructure will need to be in place or agreed before land is released or planning permission is granted.</p> <p>Concerned that the quality of life of residents will be reduced if infrastructure is not provided.</p>	None stated.	<p>As part of the process of adopting a Development Plan Document such as the Site Allocations DPD, there are three main opportunities for the community to comment on the document. The Regulation 18 consultation, which took place for six weeks in 2015, the Regulation 19 consultation due to take place in 2016 as well as at the Examination in Public. Therefore there are still further opportunities to comment on the document.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
115	Simon	Thomas	GB12	Supports development of the site for more housing as it is needed in the area. Also supports more public transport for the area.	None stated.	<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
115	Simon	Thomas	GB13	Supports development of the site for more housing as it is needed in the area. Also supports more public transport for the area.	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB4	Local schools are at capacity. A 900 pupil private school will not help the situation as residents can not afford the fees	None stated.	<p>With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8</p> <p>In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB5	Local schools are at capacity. A 900 pupil private school will not help the situation as residents can not afford the fees	None stated.	<p>With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8</p> <p>In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB12	Local schools are at capacity. A 900 pupil private school will not help the situation as residents can not afford the fees	None stated.	<p>With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB13	Local schools are at capacity. A 900 pupil private school will not help the situation as residents can not afford the fees	None stated.	<p>With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8</p> <p>In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB15	Local schools are at capacity. A 900 pupil private school will not help the situation as residents can not afford the fees	None stated.	<p>With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8</p> <p>In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB16	Local schools are at capacity. A 900 pupil private school will not help the situation as residents can not afford the fees	None stated.	<p>With respect to school provision, this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8</p> <p>In addition, the planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that is separate from the proposals in the draft Site Allocation DPD. In the draft Site Allocation DPD, the Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation needs of the elderly.</p> <p>The planning application is being considered in advance of the Site Allocation DPD for the site and therefore will be assessed on its own merits.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB4	Concerned that proposals will have an impact on the local infrastructure. Parvis Road is gridlocked at rush hour. 1400 new homes will exacerbate problems	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
355	Sue	Thomas	GB5	Concerned that proposals will have an impact on the local infrastructure. Parvis Road is gridlocked at rush hour. 1400 new homes will exacerbate problems	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB16	Concerned that proposals will have an impact on the local infrastructure. Parvis Road is gridlocked at rush hour. 1400 new homes will exacerbate problems	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
355	Sue	Thomas	GB12	Concerned that proposals will have an impact on the local infrastructure. Parvis Road is gridlocked at rush hour. 1400 new homes will exacerbate problems	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB15	Concerned that proposals will have an impact on the local infrastructure. Parvis Road is gridlocked at rush hour. 1400 new homes will exacerbate problems	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
355	Sue	Thomas	GB13	Concerned that proposals will have an impact on the local infrastructure. Parvis Road is gridlocked at rush hour. 1400 new homes will exacerbate problems	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
355	Sue	Thomas	GB4	The doctors at West Byfleet is full and difficult to get appointments. Proposals will exacerbate the problem	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB5	The doctors at West Byfleet is full and difficult to get appointments. Proposals will exacerbate the problem	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB12	The doctors at West Byfleet is full and difficult to get appointments. Proposals will exacerbate the problem	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB13	The doctors at West Byfleet is full and difficult to get appointments. Proposals will exacerbate the problem	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
355	Sue	Thomas	GB15	The doctors at West Byfleet is full and difficult to get appointments. Proposals will exacerbate the problem	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB16	The doctors at West Byfleet is full and difficult to get appointments. Proposals will exacerbate the problem	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB4	The transport network is irregular and Arriva may be reducing their services- this will increase traffic and exacerbate problems for the elderly	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB5	The transport network is irregular and Arriva may be reducing their services- this will increase traffic and exacerbate problems for the elderly	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB12	The transport network is irregular and Arriva may be reducing their services- this will increase traffic and exacerbate problems for the elderly	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB13	The transport network is irregular and Arriva may be reducing their services- this will increase traffic and exacerbate problems for the elderly	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB15	The transport network is irregular and Arriva may be reducing their services- this will increase traffic and exacerbate problems for the elderly	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
355	Sue	Thomas	GB16	The transport network is irregular and Arriva may be reducing their services- this will increase traffic and exacerbate problems for the elderly	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
1538	D	Thomas	GB4	The proposals will likely result in an additional 400 cars, all of which will use A245. Does anyone really want this?	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1538	D	Thomas	GB5	The proposals will likely result in an additional 400 cars, all of which will use A245. Does anyone really want this?	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment. Potential issues to be addressed are also noted within the allocation, including site access arrangements. These measures will be considered and addressed at the detailed planning application stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1538	D	Thomas	GB4	What about services for the new houses. Nice to have a private school for those that can afford it.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>To clarify, 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1538	D	Thomas	GB5	What about services for the new houses. Nice to have a private school for those that can afford it.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure provision has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>To clarify, 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1538	D	Thomas	GB4	With mortgages going up, will young families be able to afford to buy these houses.	None stated.	<p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1538	D	Thomas	GB5	With mortgages going up, will young families be able to afford to buy these houses.	None stated.	<p>Woking is a relatively affluent Borough and is placed within the top 20 per cent of wealthiest local authorities nationally. However affordability, or the ability for people to get on the property ladder, is a key issue. Through the Government's commitment to the delivery of starter homes as well as Core Strategy Policy CS12: Affordable Housing, the Council will continue to seek the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough to meet local need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1538	D	Thomas	GB4	Green Belt should be preserved as set out when it was established	None stated.	<p>This representation 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
1538	D	Thomas	GB5	Green Belt should be preserved as set out when it was established	None stated.	<p>This representation 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
279	Janet	Thompson	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
279	Janet	Thompson	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	<p>Any proposals that come forward will need to comply with other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council also has a draft policy in its Development Management Policies DPD (submitted for independent examination in February 2016) DM7 Noise and Light pollution.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0	
279	Janet	Thompson	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
279	Janet	Thompson	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
279	Janet	Thompson	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Please also see Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
279	Janet	Thompson	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
279	Janet	Thompson	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
279	Janet	Thompson	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
279	Janet	Thompson	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
279	Janet	Thompson	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
926	D	Thompson	GB12	Concerned what access routes to the sites will be chosen. Lovelace Drive/Teggs Lane and east of Upshot Lane/south of Aviary Road would require CPOs, are local roads not	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking 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
				<p>designed for heavy traffic volumes and would heavily impact existing residents.</p> <p>Access from Upshot Lane will make the traffic situation worse and cause severe disruption during the construction phase.</p> <p>Concerned about the level of traffic on Pyrford Primary School.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on school numbers.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on access to doctor and dental facilities.</p>		<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 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>	
926	D	Thompson	GB13	<p>Concerned what access routes to the sites will be chosen. Lovelace Drive/Teggs Lane and east of Upshot Lane/south of Aviary Road would require CPOs, are local roads not designed for heavy traffic volumes and would heavily impact existing residents.</p> <p>Access from Upshot Lane will make the traffic situation worse and cause severe disruption during the construction phase.</p> <p>Concerned about the level of traffic on Pyrford Primary School.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on school numbers.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on access to doctor and dental facilities.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
926	D	Thompson	GB12	Object to development proposals on the Green Belt. The land is arable and used for crop production.	None stated.	<p>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>The Council believe that the site should be safeguarded for future development needs and can be developed without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
926	D	Thompson	GB13	Object to development proposals on the Green Belt. The land is arable and used for crop production.	None stated.	<p>As part of the site selection process, the Council ruled out potential development on land classified as being of high agricultural quality. This site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>The Council believe that the site should be safeguarded for future development needs and can be developed without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
926	D	Thompson	GB12	Government policy favours intensification of brownfield sites over development of Greenbelt. Proposed development will destroy the village character of Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
926	D	Thompson	GB13	Government policy favours intensification of brownfield sites over development of Greenbelt. Proposed development will destroy the village character of Pyrford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0, 16.0 and 23.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB8	Developing the sites will not check unrestricted sprawl and prevent neighbouring towns merging. The GBBR highlights the importance of the sites in preserving the green gap between Woking and Mayford. GB9 proposal is to have a 'sense of separation', therefore there wont be any separation. GB8 is stated as having little or no amenities, which is why GB9 is earmarked for future development in this regard. Therefore it is encouraging future growth in the area.	None stated.	The representation regarding sprawl and separation between settlements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB9	Developing the sites will not check unrestricted sprawl and prevent neighbouring towns merging. The GBBR highlights the importance of the sites in preserving the green gap between Woking and Mayford. GB9 proposal is to have a 'sense of separation', therefore there wont be any separation. GB8 is stated as having little or no amenities, which is why GB9 is earmarked for future development in this regard. Therefore it is encouraging future growth in the area.	None stated.	The representation regarding sprawl and separation between settlements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB10	Developing the sites will not check unrestricted sprawl and prevent neighbouring towns merging. The GBBR highlights the importance of the sites in preserving the green gap between Woking and Mayford. GB9 proposal is to have a 'sense of separation', therefore there wont be any separation. GB8 is stated as having little or no amenities, which is why GB9 is earmarked for future development in this regard. Therefore it is encouraging future growth in the area.	None stated.	The representation regarding sprawl and separation between settlements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB11	Developing the sites will not check unrestricted sprawl and prevent neighbouring towns merging. The GBBR highlights the importance of the sites in preserving the green gap between Woking and Mayford. GB9 proposal is to have a 'sense of separation', therefore there wont be any separation. GB8 is stated as having little or no amenities, which is why GB9 is earmarked for future development in this regard. Therefore it is encouraging future growth in the area.	None stated.	The representation regarding sprawl and separation between settlements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB14	Developing the sites will not check unrestricted sprawl and prevent neighbouring towns merging. The GBBR highlights the importance of the sites in preserving the green gap between Woking and Mayford. GB9 proposal is to have a 'sense of separation', therefore there wont be any separation. GB8 is stated as having little or no amenities, which is why GB9 is earmarked for future development in this regard. Therefore it is encouraging future growth in the area.	None stated.	The representation regarding sprawl and separation between settlements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 15.0 and 12.0. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community	No further modification is 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 meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.	
961	Helena	Thompson	GB7	The Core Strategy has a stated need for 19 pitches, but the DPD identifies 22. This is likely to be even higher as travelling show-people pitches have not been included.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS14 states that there is a need for one pitch to meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople over the Plan period. Due to the nature of Travelling Showpeople, the additional pitch noted in the Core Strategy is a strategic site and the Council is working with the other authorities in Surrey to identify the exact location. The Site Allocations DPD is very clear that GB7 is proposed to be allocated for 12 pitches in addition to the existing three pitches on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB8	Lists the five purposes of the Green Belt. Developing Mayford Green Belt this will not assist in the safeguarding the countryside . National policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't demonstrated 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 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB9	Lists the five purposes of the Green Belt. Developing Mayford Green Belt this will not assist in the safeguarding the countryside . National policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't demonstrated 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 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB10	Lists the five purposes of the Green Belt. Developing Mayford Green Belt this will not assist in the safeguarding the countryside . National policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't demonstrated 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 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB11	Lists the five purposes of the Green Belt. Developing Mayford Green Belt this will not assist in the safeguarding the countryside . National policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't demonstrated 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 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB14	Lists the five purposes of the Green Belt. Developing Mayford Green Belt this will not assist in the safeguarding the countryside . National policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and the Council hasn't demonstrated 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 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB7	Object to increasing the number of pitches on the site. The GBBR states that only if the Council is unable to deliver urban sites within the next 5 years or to 2027 should the Green Belt be considered. The plan does not take up the external specialist advice or National Planning Policy.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4 to 4.6.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB8	Developing the sites will not assist urban regeneration. If WTC sites are only suitable for high density flatted development and not achieve the necessary mix of housing types it therefore means developments in the Green Belt cannot be flats. Users from a mix of housing types, such as the elderly or people in social housing, would not be well supported due to a lack of local amenities and transport links. The GBBR transport assessment did not take into account the frequency or accessibility of the stated bus routes, which are infrequent and only accessible down a country road. 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.	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. The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council 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.</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>	
961	Helena	Thompson	GB9	<p>Developing the sites will not assist urban regeneration. If WTC sites are only suitable for high density flatted development and not achieve the necessary mix of housing types it therefore means developments in the Green Belt cannot be flats. Users from a mix of housing types, such as the elderly or people in social housing, would not be well supported due to a lack of local amenities and transport links. The GBBR transport assessment did not take into account the frequency or accessibility of the stated bus routes, which are infrequent and only accessible down a country road. 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.</p>	None stated.	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council 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.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB11	<p>Developing the sites will not assist urban regeneration. If WTC sites are only suitable for high density flatted development and not achieve the necessary mix of housing types it therefore means developments in the Green Belt cannot be flats. Users from a mix of housing types, such as the elderly or people in social housing, would not be well supported due to a lack of local amenities and transport links. The GBBR transport assessment did not take into account the frequency or accessibility of the stated bus routes, which are infrequent and only accessible down a country road. 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.</p>	None stated.	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worpleston Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation.</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>	
961	Helena	Thompson	GB14	<p>Developing the sites will not assist urban regeneration. If WTC sites are only suitable for high density flatted development and not achieve the necessary mix of housing types it therefore means developments in the Green Belt cannot be flats. Users from a mix of housing types, such as the elderly or people in social housing, would not be well supported due to a lack of local amenities and transport links. The GBBR transport assessment did not take into account the frequency or accessibility of the stated bus routes, which are infrequent and only accessible down a country road. 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.</p>	None stated.	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian access to Worpleston Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB10	<p>Developing the sites will not assist urban regeneration. If WTC sites are only suitable for high density flatted development and not achieve the necessary mix of housing types it therefore means developments in the Green Belt cannot be flats. Users from a mix of housing types, such as the elderly or people in social housing, would not be well supported due to a lack of local amenities and transport links. The GBBR transport assessment did not take into account the frequency or accessibility of the stated bus routes, which are infrequent and only accessible down a country road. 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</p>	None stated.	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the</p>	No further modification is 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 be over half an hour.		<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. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council 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.</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>	
961	Helena	Thompson	GB8	Developing the sites does not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Mayford is a historical village mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 is noted as area of High Archaeological Potential therefore the character of the village should be considered. The proposed densities are therefore significant. Contrary to the DPD, GB11 actually backs onto properties in Hook Heath that are much lower in density. The proposed densities are excessive compared to Mayford and Hook Heath.	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>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 housing need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB9	Developing the sites does not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Mayford is a historical village mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 is noted as area of High Archaeological Potential therefore the character of the village should be considered. The proposed densities are therefore significant. Contrary to the DPD, GB11 actually backs onto properties in Hook Heath that are much lower in density. The proposed densities are excessive compared to Mayford and Hook Heath.	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>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 housing need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB10	Developing the sites does not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Mayford is a historical village mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 is noted as area of High Archaeological Potential therefore the character of the village should be considered. The proposed densities are therefore significant. Contrary to the DPD, GB11 actually backs onto properties in Hook Heath that are much lower in density. The proposed densities are excessive compared to Mayford and Hook Heath.	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>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 housing need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
961	Helena	Thompson	GB11	Developing the sites does not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Mayford is a historical village mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 is noted as area of High Archaeological Potential therefore the character of the village should be considered. The proposed densities are therefore significant. Contrary to the DPD, GB11 actually backs onto properties in Hook Heath that are much lower in density. The proposed densities are excessive compared to Mayford and Hook Heath.	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>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 housing need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB14	Developing the sites does not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Mayford is a historical village mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 is noted as area of High Archaeological Potential therefore the character of the village should be considered. The proposed densities are therefore significant. Contrary to the DPD, GB11 actually backs onto properties in Hook Heath that are much lower in density. The proposed densities are excessive compared to Mayford and Hook Heath.	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>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 housing need.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB8	Please reconsider your plans. What is currently proposed will have a large impact on Mayford and Hook Heath as uniquely characterised areas.	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
961	Helena	Thompson	GB9	Please reconsider your plans. What is currently proposed will have a large impact on Mayford and Hook Heath as uniquely characterised areas.	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
961	Helena	Thompson	GB10	Please reconsider your plans. What is currently proposed will have a large impact on Mayford and Hook Heath as uniquely characterised areas.	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
961	Helena	Thompson	GB11	Please reconsider your plans. What is currently proposed will have a large impact on Mayford and Hook Heath as uniquely characterised areas.	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
961	Helena	Thompson	GB14	Please reconsider your plans. What is currently proposed will have a large impact on Mayford and Hook Heath as uniquely characterised areas.	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
961	Helena	Thompson	GB8	Object to development of the sites. The GBBR states land around the periphery of WTC significantly contributes to Green Belt purposes, is well defined to the south and significantly contributes to the separation between Woking and Guildford. Therefore does not agree with the Council's statement 'ensuring the enduring performance of the Green	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Belt.			
961	Helena	Thompson	GB9	Object to development of the sites. The GBBR states land around the periphery of WTC significantly contributes to Green Belt purposes, is well defined to the south and significantly contributes to the separation between Woking and Guildford. Therefore does not agree with the Council's statement 'ensuring the enduring performance of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB10	Object to development of the sites. The GBBR states land around the periphery of WTC significantly contributes to Green Belt purposes, is well defined to the south and significantly contributes to the separation between Woking and Guildford. Therefore does not agree with the Council's statement 'ensuring the enduring performance of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB11	Object to development of the sites. The GBBR states land around the periphery of WTC significantly contributes to Green Belt purposes, is well defined to the south and significantly contributes to the separation between Woking and Guildford. Therefore does not agree with the Council's statement 'ensuring the enduring performance of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB14	Object to development of the sites. The GBBR states land around the periphery of WTC significantly contributes to Green Belt purposes, is well defined to the south and significantly contributes to the separation between Woking and Guildford. Therefore does not agree with the Council's statement 'ensuring the enduring performance of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB7	Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would increase the noise, pollution and traffic and decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
961	Helena	Thompson	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There has been no consideration on the impact the traffic will have on the character of the area as Mayford residential areas become shortcuts through to St John's and North Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
961	Helena	Thompson	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There has been no consideration on the impact the traffic will have on the character of the area as Mayford residential areas become shortcuts through to St John's and North Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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
961	Helena	Thompson	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There has been no consideration on the impact the traffic will have on the character of the area as Mayford residential areas become shortcuts through to St John's and North Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
961	Helena	Thompson	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There has been no consideration on the impact the traffic will have on the character of the area as Mayford residential areas become shortcuts through to St John's and North Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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
961	Helena	Thompson	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. There has been no consideration on the impact the traffic will have on the character of the area as Mayford residential areas become shortcuts through to St John's and North Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 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
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	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
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB7	The Core Strategy outlines the need for 19 pitches whilst the DPD identifies 3 additional pitches, bringing the total to 22 excluding the need for travelling show-people. The number required is therefore likely to be higher than outlined.	None stated.	Core Strategy Policy CS14 states that there is a need for one pitch to meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople over the Plan period. Due to the nature of Travelling Showpeople, the additional pitch noted in the Core Strategy is a strategic site and the Council is working with the other authorities in Surrey to identify the exact location. The Site Allocations DPD is very clear that GB7 is proposed to be allocated for 12 pitches in addition to the existing three pitches on the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB8	Strongly object. Developing the site will not support the five purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As noted within the site assessment in the Green Belt boundary review, the site does not perform any critical Green Belt purpose. It does perform one major purpose which is in relation to the escarpment and containing the existing urban area. However according to the review, other suitable Green Belt boundaries exist and the Council is therefore confident that development of the site will not have a significant adverse impact on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB9	Strongly object. Developing the site will not support the five purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As noted within the site assessment in the Green Belt boundary review, the site does not perform any critical Green Belt purpose. It does perform one major purpose which is in relation to the escarpment and containing the existing urban area. However according to the review, other suitable Green Belt boundaries exist and the Council is therefore confident that development of the site will not have a significant adverse impact on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB10	Strongly object. Developing the site will not support the five purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As noted within the site assessment in the Green Belt boundary review, the site does not perform any critical Green Belt purpose. It does perform one major purpose which is in relation to the escarpment and containing the existing urban area. However according to the review, other suitable Green Belt boundaries exist and the Council is therefore confident that development of the site will not have a significant adverse impact on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB11	Strongly object. Developing the site will not support the five purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As noted within the site assessment in the Green Belt boundary review, the site does not perform any critical Green Belt purpose. It does perform one major purpose which is in relation to the escarpment and containing the existing urban area. However according to the review, other suitable Green Belt boundaries exist and the Council is therefore confident that development of the site will not have a significant adverse impact on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB14	Strongly object. Developing the site will not support the five purposes of Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. As noted within the site assessment in the Green Belt boundary review, the site does not perform any critical Green Belt purpose. It does perform one major purpose which is in relation to the escarpment and containing the existing urban area. However according to the review, other suitable Green Belt boundaries exist and the Council is therefore confident that development of the site will not have a significant adverse impact on the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB7	Object to the proposal. The site is adjacent to an SSSI which is used by local residents for leisure purposes. The proposals will increase noise, pollution and traffic for ensuring the required amenities were in place but also reduce visual amenity and character of the area which would threaten wildlife.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding 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 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 believes that the combination of the Site Allocations DPD, the Core Strategy, Development Management Policies DPD and other Development Plan Documents, there is a robust policy framework in place to ensure that development of the site will not have a significant negative impact on the local area or environment.</p>	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	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. Also no consideration on the character of Mayford or Hook Heath. The proposals go against the ethos of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Please reconsider.	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 improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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 impact of the proposed development on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>Excluding site GB14 which is proposed to be allocated for green infrastructure and not development, none of the proposed allocations fall within the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	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. Also no consideration on the character of Mayford or Hook Heath. The proposals go against the ethos of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Please reconsider.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed 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 representation regarding the impact of the proposed development on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>Excluding site GB14 which is proposed to be allocated for green infrastructure and not development, none of the proposed allocations fall within the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Area.</p>	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	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. Also no consideration on the character of Mayford or Hook Heath. The proposals go against the ethos of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Please reconsider.	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 improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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 impact of the proposed development on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>Excluding site GB14 which is proposed to be allocated for green infrastructure and not development, none of the proposed allocations fall within the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	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	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Also no consideration on the character of Mayford or Hook Heath. The proposals go against the ethos of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Please reconsider.		<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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 impact of the proposed development on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>Excluding site GB14 which is proposed to be allocated for green infrastructure and not development, none of the proposed allocations fall within the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Area.</p>	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Also no consideration on the character of Mayford or Hook Heath. The proposals go against the ethos of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Please reconsider.	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 improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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 impact of the proposed development on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>Excluding site GB14 which is proposed to be allocated for green infrastructure and not development, none of the proposed allocations fall within the Hook Heath Neighbourhood</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Area.	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB8	Mayford is a historical village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 contains an area of High Archaeological Potential and this confirms that the Green Belt sites are of historic importance. The character of the village should be considered and the proposed densities are not in keeping with the surrounding context. Saunders Lane is a boundary between GB11 and properties to the south of Saunders Lane, with GB11 being linked to the character of GB11. 30dph or more is excessive.	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>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policies CS21, CS20 and CS24 provide a robust policy framework to ensure that new development responds to local townscape and landscape character. The emerging Development Management Policies DPD also provides further policy on design matters, whilst the Design SPD provides a significant amount of best practice guidance.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB9	Mayford is a historical village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 contains an area of High Archaeological Potential and this confirms that the Green Belt sites are of historic importance. The character of the village should be considered and the proposed densities are not in keeping with the surrounding context. Saunders Lane is a boundary between GB11 and properties to the south of Saunders Lane, with GB11 being linked to the character of GB11. 30dph or more is excessive.	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>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policies CS21, CS20 and CS24 provide a robust policy framework to ensure that new development responds to local townscape and landscape character. The emerging Development Management Policies DPD also provides further policy on design matters, whilst the Design SPD provides a significant amount of best practice guidance.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB10	Mayford is a historical village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 contains an area of High Archaeological Potential and this confirms that the Green Belt sites are of historic importance. The character of the village should be considered and the proposed densities are not in keeping with the surrounding context. Saunders Lane is a boundary between GB11 and properties to the south of Saunders Lane, with GB11 being linked to the character of GB11. 30dph or more is excessive.	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>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policies CS21, CS20 and CS24 provide a robust policy framework to ensure that new development responds to local townscape and landscape character. The emerging Development Management Policies DPD also provides further policy on design matters, whilst the Design SPD provides a significant amount of best practice guidance.</p>	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB11	<p>Mayford is a historical village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 contains an area of High Archaeological Potential and this confirms that the Green Belt sites are of historic importance. The character of the village should be considered and the proposed densities are not in keeping with the surrounding context. Saunders Lane is a boundary between GB11 and properties to the south of Saunders Lane, with GB11 being linked to the character of GB11. 30dph or more is excessive.</p>	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>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policies CS21, CS20 and CS24 provide a robust policy framework to ensure that new development responds to local townscape and landscape character. The emerging Development Management Policies DPD also provides further policy on design matters, whilst the Design SPD provides a significant amount of best practice guidance.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB14	<p>Mayford is a historical village and mentioned in the Domesday Book. GB8 contains an area of High Archaeological Potential and this confirms that the Green Belt sites are of historic importance. The character of the village should be considered and the proposed densities are not in keeping with the surrounding context. Saunders Lane is a boundary between GB11 and properties to the south of Saunders Lane, with GB11 being linked to the character of GB11. 30dph or more is excessive.</p>	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>The Core Strategy (Policy CS10: Housing provision and distribution) provides an indication of the densities that could be achieved at various broad locations such as the Green Belt. The Council takes the view that the proposed anticipated densities are reasonable and are broadly in line with the Core Strategy. It is always emphasised that the proposed densities are indicative and actual densities can only be agreed on a case by case basis depending on the merits of each proposal at the planning application stage. As a general rule, it is important to highlight that lesser densities would require the Council to identify more Green Belt land to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policies CS21, CS20 and CS24 provide a robust policy framework to ensure that new development responds to local townscape and landscape character. The emerging Development Management Policies DPD also provides further policy on design matters, whilst the Design SPD provides a significant amount of best practice guidance.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB8	<p>GBBR highlights the importance of the site in preserving the gap between Woking and Mayford and the risk of compromising the integrity of the gap between the town and village. The proposals seek to mitigate this through screening by trees. GB9 will not allow the separation between Mayford and Woking. GB8 has little or no amenities. This will not prevent sprawl and will encourage further growth in the local area.</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to</p>	No further modification is proposed 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>	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB9	GBBR highlights the importance of the site in preserving the gap between Woking and Mayford and the risk of compromising the integrity of the gap between the town and village. The proposals seek to mitigate this through screening by trees. GB9 will not allow the separation between Mayford and Woking. GB8 has little or no amenities. This will not prevent sprawl and will encourage further growth in the local area.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB10	GBBR highlights the importance of the site in preserving the gap between Woking and Mayford and the risk of compromising the integrity of the gap between the town and village. The proposals seek to mitigate this through screening by trees. GB9 will not allow the separation between Mayford and Woking. GB8 has little or no amenities. This will not prevent sprawl and will encourage further growth in the local area.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB11	GBBR highlights the importance of the site in preserving the gap between Woking and Mayford and the risk of compromising the integrity of the gap between the town and village. The proposals seek to mitigate this through screening by trees. GB9 will not allow the separation between Mayford and Woking. GB8 has little or no amenities. This will not prevent sprawl and will encourage further growth in the local area.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB14	GBBR highlights the importance of the site in preserving the gap between Woking and Mayford and the risk of compromising the integrity of the gap between the town and village. The proposals seek to mitigate this through screening by trees. GB9 will not allow the separation between Mayford and Woking. GB8 has little or no amenities. This will not prevent sprawl and will encourage further growth in the local area.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 15.0.</p> <p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. Finally it should be noted the site GB14 is not allocated for development but for green infrastructure.	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB8	Removing these sites will not safeguard the countryside. Although the Core Strategy has a requirement for 550 homes, the additional safeguarded sites are not inline with the NPPF that only allows the release of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances. WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB9	Removing these sites will not safeguard the countryside. Although the Core Strategy has a requirement for 550 homes, the additional safeguarded sites are not inline with the NPPF that only allows the release of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances. WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB10	Removing these sites will not safeguard the countryside. Although the Core Strategy has a requirement for 550 homes, the additional safeguarded sites are not inline with the NPPF that only allows the release of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances. WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB11	Removing these sites will not safeguard the countryside. Although the Core Strategy has a requirement for 550 homes, the additional safeguarded sites are not inline with the NPPF that only allows the release of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances. WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB14	Removing these sites will not safeguard the countryside. Although the Core Strategy has a requirement for 550 homes, the additional safeguarded sites are not inline with the NPPF that only allows the release of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances. WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB8	Acknowledged that urban sites have been explored for development but only for high density flatted development, and would therefore not achieve the housing mix required. No developments in the Green Belt can therefore be flats. The dismissal of urban sites where flats could be built and the acceptance of Green Belt land for development do not appear to account for the fact that the mix of housing types needed would not be well supported outside of the town areas. Vulnerable, older persons and those needing affordable housing are let down by poor infrastructure links. The local transport is infrequent and inaccessible. Travelling times to Woking Town Centre are longer than stated.	No flatted developments within the Green Belt	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. The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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 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. The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity 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>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>	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB9	<p>Acknowledged that urban sites have been explored for development but only for high density flatted development, and would therefore not achieve the housing mix required. No developments in the Green Belt can therefore be flats. The dismissal of urban sites where flats could be built and the acceptance of Green Belt land for development do not appear to account for the fact that the mix of housing types needed would not be well supported outside of the town areas. Vulnerable, older persons and those needing affordable housing are let down by poor infrastructure links. The local transport is infrequent and inaccessible. Travelling times to Woking Town Centre are longer than stated.</p>	No flatted developments within the Green Belt	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council 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.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB10	<p>Acknowledged that urban sites have been explored for development but only for high density flatted development, and would therefore not achieve the housing mix required. No developments in the Green Belt can therefore be flats. The dismissal of urban sites where flats could be built and the acceptance of Green Belt land for development do not appear to account for the fact that the mix of housing types needed would not be well supported outside of the town areas. Vulnerable, older persons and those needing affordable housing are let down by poor infrastructure links. The local transport is infrequent and inaccessible. Travelling times to Woking Town Centre are longer than stated.</p>	No flatted developments within the Green Belt	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>access to Worplesdon Station to see what can be done to address the existing situation.</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>	
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB11	<p>Acknowledged that urban sites have been explored for development but only for high density flatted development, and would therefore not achieve the housing mix required. No developments in the Green Belt can therefore be flats. The dismissal of urban sites where flats could be built and the acceptance of Green Belt land for development do not appear to account for the fact that the mix of housing types needed would not be well supported outside of the town areas. Vulnerable, older persons and those needing affordable housing are let down by poor infrastructure links. The local transport is infrequent and inaccessible. Travelling times to Woking Town Centre are longer than stated.</p>	No flatted developments within the Green Belt	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Council 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.</p> <p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1657	Genevieve	Thompson	GB14	<p>Acknowledged that urban sites have been explored for development but only for high density flatted development, and would therefore not achieve the housing mix required. No developments in the Green Belt can therefore be flats. The dismissal of urban sites where flats could be built and the acceptance of Green Belt land for development do not appear to account for the fact that the mix of housing types needed would not be well supported outside of the town areas. Vulnerable, older persons and those needing affordable housing are let down by poor infrastructure links. The local transport is infrequent and inaccessible. Travelling times to Woking Town Centre are longer than stated.</p>	No flatted developments within the Green Belt	<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>The Council has considered a significant number of sites in the existing urban area for development. These alternative sites are clearly set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>The existing bus service in the local area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council is also working with Network Rail and the train operator to increase capacity at the Borough's stations and on the network. This is reflected in site UA23. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking,</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>cycling and public transport where feasible.</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.</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>	
1004	Carl	Thomson	General	<p>Agree to the allocation of the Coals Yard/Aggregate Yard (UA41) provided arrangement can be secured for its relocation.</p> <p>Any application for the development of Southern House, Jubilee House and Lynton House (UA42) must ensure that there is adequate provision of parking in place. Ideally the Council should work with the County Council to secure the redesign and road widening of this part of Guildford road to reduce congestion. Development of the site should respect the existing listed buildings from 1 – 10 Guildford Road.</p> <p>Agree with the mixed use allocation of St Dunstan's Church (UA44) but request that due to the elevated location of the site the height of any development on the site respects the amenity of nearby residents. Recent applications for 23 and 17 storey buildings have been refused on grounds of visual impact and loss of amenity. The current consent for 7 – 11 storeys should form a benchmark of what could be acceptable. Development of the site should also respect the fact that the area is more suburban and quiet. To maximise the efficient use of land the development of the site should be planned with the development of Owen house and Somerset House. A comprehensive redevelopment of the sites would increase the number of units on the site whilst at the same time reducing the need for a much higher development.</p> <p>Agree with the allocation of Owen House (UA45) for mixed use development but would encourage a comprehensive redevelopment to include St Dunstan and Somerset House.</p> <p>If Somerset House (UA46) were to be development the current size and scale should be retained. The site is presently low density providing a transition between the high rise buildings closer to Guildford Road and Oriental Road. A development of the site on its own would not be desirable. It should be part of the wide redevelopment of the area to include St Dunstan and Owen House.</p> <p>Object to the allocation of Oriental Road car Park (UA40). A flatted development of 200 dwellings per hectare will be out of character with the suburban character of the area. To include the site in the DPD as presently set out would go against the promise given to local residents at the Core Strategy Examination that the development of the site will maintain the distinctive and peaceful character of the area. The development of the site for flatted accommodation without adequate parking will exacerbate traffic problems in the area. The development of the site without replacing the</p>	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation had been clear to emphasise that the development of the site will depend on the relocation of the existing operations on the site at a suitable location. Network Rail has promoted the site for residential development. At this stage there is no certainty that a suitable site for the relocation of the existing operation can be found. In this regard, the site area for the proposed allocation has been redefined to enable the delivery of some residential units without undermining the existing operations on the site.</p> <p>The key requirements of the allocation acknowledge the need for the development of the site to protect and enhance the adjacent locally listed buildings (1 – 10 Guildford Road). The Council has an adopted car parking standards, which will apply to the development of the site. The suggestion to work with the County Council to secure the redesign and road widening of this part of Guildford is noted and will be pursued. It would not be helpful for a Site Allocations DPD to be too prescriptive about the exact height of development on allocated sites. This is a matter of detail that could best be addressed at the planning application stage. Nevertheless, the key requirements of the allocation acknowledge the significance of height of any development on the site to respect its locational context and the amenity of nearby residents.</p> <p>The Council is very supportive of the comprehensive redevelopment of the area to also include Owen House and Somerset House. This is also acknowledged in the proposed allocation. It is emphasised that the sites are in multiple ownership but the Council will do the best it can to facilitate their comprehensive redevelopment. Each of the sites could be developed as standalone site. If that were to be the case, the Council will ensure that none of them will be out of context with the surrounding area, including the relationship with adjacent developments.</p> <p>See response to UA44 above. The Council will encourage the comprehensive redevelopment of St Dunstans, Owen House and Somerset House.</p> <p>Whilst it would not be helpful for the Site Allocations DPD to be too prescriptive about the size of the development, the key requirements of the allocation require that the building footprint of any development on the site should be of an appropriate scale to reflect the grain and character of adjacent buildings. The site can be developed as a standalone development. Nevertheless, the Council recognises the potential benefits of encouraging a comprehensive redevelopment of the area including St Dunstans and Owen House, and will be doing the best that it can to facilitate that.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the site is in a sustainable location to contribute towards meeting the housing requirement of the Core strategy. The principle of developing the site for housing is defensible because it was comprehensively debated at the Core Strategy Examination and supported by the Inspector. At the Core Strategy Examination the indicative capacity of the site was estimated at 250 dwellings. This was counted towards delivering the housing trajectory for the Core Strategy. The link below is the Table of the list of Town Centre sites that were agreed at the Examination.</p> <p>The key requirements of the allocation and the policies of the Core strategy will ensure that the development of the site does not detract from the general character of the area. Network Rail and the Council are keen to ensure that the development of the site will not compromise the overall need to have sufficient parking to serve the Station. The Council has an adopted car parking standards, which will apply to any development of the site.</p> <p>http://www.woking2027.info/corestrategy/csexamination/csexaminationdocs/wbc17a.pdf</p> <p>It will be too prescriptive for the Site Allocations DPD to determine the height of any development on the site. This is a matter of detail that can appropriately be determined 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>lost parking spaces elsewhere would exacerbate parking and congestion issues in the area. Any development of the site should first respect the character of the area and be small, suburban and be restricted to no more than two to three storeys in height. Secondly, there must be an alternative parking provision to serve the Station before the development commences and finally, the development should only take place as part of a fundamental redesign of Station approach and the road network at the entrance to Woking station to address existing congestion and gridlock.</p> <p>Object to the allocation of the Royal Mail Sorting Office (UA39) because of the potential adverse impacts on the character of the area. It will add to the existing congestion in the area. Development would be impractical and unfeasible given the traffic, congestion and gridlock at the junction with the Station.</p> <p>Agree with the allocation of Quadrant Court (UA43) for office use. However, the location of the site does not make it suitable for high rise flatted developments.</p> <p>The Council must ensure that the burden of meeting housing need is shared more equitably across the Borough.</p>		<p>The town centre location of the site makes it suitable for residential development if the existing operation could be relocated. There is significant residential presence in the area and it is envisaged that the development of the site will not compromise the amenity of nearby residents. The site is in close proximity to the railway station and other key services and facilities to help minimise the need for car travel. The key requirements of the allocation require any proposal for the development of the site to be accompanied by a detailed transport assessment to assess the traffic implications of the proposed development and identify any appropriate mitigation measures that might be necessary. The Council is satisfied that overall the sustainable development of the site can be achieved. The Council has an adopted car parking standards, which will apply to the development of the site.</p> <p>The support for the allocation of the site is acknowledged. The Council will ensure through the application of existing policies in the Core Strategy that the height of any proposal is sympathetic to its context.</p> <p>The Council has already approved the overall spatial strategy of the Core Strategy. Most new development will be concentrated on previously developed land in the main urban centres of the Borough. Green Belt sites will be released to meet development needs between 2022 and 2027. Site will also be safeguarded to meet future development needs beyond 2027. The Site Allocations DPD is in general conformity with this overall approach and the sites that are allocated are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. It would not always be possible that the equitable distribution of development across the Borough would be the most sustainable because of the existing constraints in the area. However, in all cases where development occurs the Council will make sure that their impacts are minimised.</p>	
183	David	Thorne	GB11	<p>The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB8	<p>The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The school now has the benefit of planning approval. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB9	<p>The proposed changes would make Green Belt boundaries weaker to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green</p>	No further modification is 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. The school has now got the benefit of planning approval. The Council has always been clear that the site is allocated for a school and residential.	
183	David	Thorne	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Proposed allocation at Egley Road has been clear that the proposal is 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
183	David	Thorne	GB8	I am grateful for Mayford Village Society's work in assessing the proposals for development of Mayford Village. These seem very flawed and inappropriate. Government guidelines have been flouted with selective interpretation of other aspects. I strongly object. If implemented the proposals would devastate many local and adjacent areas. I attach the MVS findings.	None stated.	It is not envisage that the proposals will significantly undermine the distinctive character of the area. The Council has carried out an assessment of the landscape capacity of the proposed sites to accommodate change, and it is not envisage that the landscape setting of the areas will be significantly undermined. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 7 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The overall justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is addressed in detail in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	General	The Council has not followed Government guidance to protect Green Belt land. Peter Brett Associates methodology is flawed, resulting in Mayford's inclusion for Green Belt release.	None stated.	The Council has following Government guidance in preparing the DPD. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1. The Green Belt boundary review report is a useful study to inform the Council's selection of preferred sites for allocation. The robustness of the approach taken to carry out the Green Belt boundary review is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10. The Council does not think that the study is flawed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. 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
183	David	Thorne	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. 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
183	David	Thorne	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
183	David	Thorne	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.	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined. The character of Mayford in particular is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This particular matter has been addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. Land ownership has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular issues is also addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.		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.	
183	David	Thorne	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter has been addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	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 does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. The Council states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land 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 proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford and the physical separation of between Woking and Guildford. These matters are addressed in Sections 12, 15, 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
183	David	Thorne	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	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	No further modification is 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 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.		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.	
183	David	Thorne	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored	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
183	David	Thorne	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. 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
183	David	Thorne	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	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	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,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				allowed within 400m.		which is valued for its ecological significance and which has its own policy designation. See Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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 Sections 4 and 10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
183	David	Thorne	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB11	The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB8	The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
183	David	Thorne	GB9	The GBBR recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.		<p>Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	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
183	David	Thorne	GB7	Traveller sites should not have unacceptable adverse impact on visual amenity and character. The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI.	None stated.	<p>Based on the available evidence, the proposal will not have significant adverse impacts on the general character of the area and/or the SSSI. 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
1149	Engelbert ha	Thorne	GB12	I object. I am greatly concerned, we enjoy and live here for the village like environment.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is	No further modification is 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 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt	
1149	Engelbert ha	Thorne	GB13	I object. I am greatly concerned, we enjoy and live here for the village like environment.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1149	Engelbert ha	Thorne	GB12	The development will create an enormous problem on local narrow roads and infrastructure. Some extra housing is needed but any development could be smaller to preserve the green area around Pyrford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1149	Engelbert ha	Thorne	GB13	The development will create an enormous problem on local narrow roads and infrastructure. Some extra housing is needed but any development could be smaller to preserve the green area around Pyrford.	None stated.	The support for a smaller scale development in Pyrford is noted. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 2. The Council is satisfied that the sites can be developed without significantly undermining the overall character of the area. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB8	House building should be confined to brownfield sites, which is the Governments intention.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB9	House building should be confined to brownfield sites, which is the Governments intention.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB10	House building should be confined to brownfield sites, which is the Governments intention.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB11	House building should be confined to brownfield sites, which is the Governments intention.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	General	House building should be confined to brownfield sites, which is the Governments intention.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0, 2.0, 9.0 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB9	Totally opposed to any more building on Green Belt. As Woking has expanded way beyond imagination, Green Belt is now more vital than ever.	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. Consideration of alternative, including urban area sites, is covered in this paper at Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Section 21.0 may also be of interest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB10	Totally opposed to any more building on Green Belt. As Woking has expanded way beyond imagination, Green Belt is now more vital than ever.	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. Consideration of alternative, including urban area sites, is covered in this paper at Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Section 21.0 may also be of interest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB11	Totally opposed to any more building on Green Belt. As Woking has expanded way beyond imagination, Green Belt is now more vital than ever.	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. Consideration of alternative, including urban area sites, is covered in this paper at Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Section 21.0 may also be of interest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	General	Totally opposed to any more building on Green Belt. As Woking has expanded way beyond imagination, Green Belt is now more vital than ever.	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. Consideration of alternative, including urban area sites, is covered in this paper at Sections 9.0 and 11.0. Section 21.0 may also be of interest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB8	Aware of the colossal profits on offer but it is the duty of the Council to protect the interests of its citizens. This comes before any thought of monetary gains, however vast.	None stated.	The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not for monetary gain, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB9	Aware of the colossal profits on offer but it is the duty of the Council to protect the interests of its citizens. This comes before any thought of monetary gains, however vast.	None stated.	The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not for monetary gain, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB10	Aware of the colossal profits on offer but it is the duty of the Council to protect the interests of its citizens. This comes before any thought of monetary gains, however vast.	None stated.	Comment noted. The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not for monetary gain, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB11	Aware of the colossal profits on offer but it is the duty of the Council to protect the interests of its citizens. This comes before any thought of monetary gains, however vast.	None stated.	Comment noted. The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not for monetary gain, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	General	Aware of the colossal profits on offer but it is the duty of the Council to protect the interests of its citizens. This comes before any thought of monetary gains, however vast.	None stated.	Comment noted. The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not for monetary gain, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB8	Mayford is a small village and warm, friendly community. To destroy this for the sake of housing estates three times the size of the village is unbelievable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB9	Mayford is a small village and warm, friendly community. To destroy this for the sake of housing estates three times the size of the village is unbelievable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB10	Mayford is a small village and warm, friendly community. To destroy this for the sake of housing estates three times the size of the village is unbelievable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB11	Mayford is a small village and warm, friendly community. To destroy this for the sake of housing estates three times the size of the village is unbelievable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognises 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	General	Most Green Belt roundabouts are owned by speculators who bought the land many years ago for a pittance, did not look after it and suddenly fencing and barbed wire have appeared in preparation for building.	None stated.	The only roundabout proposed for development in the draft Site Allocations DPD is the Six Crossroads roundabout and environs, Chertsey Road (site GB6). This is a proposal for essential road infrastructure improvements. There is no fencing or barbed wire present at the current time, and the land would remain in the Green Belt. The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not to enable speculators profit, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB8	Most Green Belt roundabouts are owned by speculators who bought the land many years ago for a pittance, did not look	None stated.	The representation refers to a roundabout, which is not included in the site boundary of this allocation. However, at this site, justification for development of a school and leisure facilities is made in the report to Planning Committee for application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which has been	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
				after it and suddenly fencing and barbed wire have appeared in preparation for building.		granted planning permission. This may explain fencing at the site. Also, the reasons for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not to enable speculators profit, but are comprehensively set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	of this representation
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB9	Most Green Belt roundabouts are owned by speculators who bought the land many years ago for a pittance, did not look after it and suddenly fencing and barbed wire have appeared in preparation for building.	None stated.	The representation refers to a roundabout, which is not included in the site boundary of this allocation. The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not to enable speculators profit, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB10	Most Green Belt roundabouts are owned by speculators who bought the land many years ago for a pittance, did not look after it and suddenly fencing and barbed wire have appeared in preparation for building.	None stated.	The representation refers to a roundabout, which is not included in the site boundary of this allocation. The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not to enable speculators profit, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB11	Most Green Belt roundabouts are owned by speculators who bought the land many years ago for a pittance, did not look after it and suddenly fencing and barbed wire have appeared in preparation for building.	None stated.	The representation refers to a roundabout, which is not included in the site boundary of this allocation. The reasons and justification for the proposals in the draft Site Allocations DPD are not to enable speculators profit, but are comprehensively set out 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
1395	Johanna Henriette	Thorne	GB8	Reluctantly agrees with the proposal for a school and necessary facilities on Green Belt land bordering Egley Road. Most school playing fields have disappeared over the years, so the proposed sports facilities do fill a gap. The development will benefit Woking as a community.	None stated.	Support (if reluctant) noted and welcomed. The school and leisure facilities permitted at Egley Road (site GB8) will support the needs of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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 development needs, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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
1520	J.	Thornton	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.			
996	JP	Threlfall	GB10	Recognise the need for additional houses however concerned the proposals ignore the need to preserve the area's pleasant nature and surroundings.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB11	Recognise the need for additional houses however concerned the proposals ignore the need to preserve the area's pleasant nature and surroundings.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB14	Recognise the need for additional houses however concerned the proposals ignore the need to preserve the area's pleasant nature and surroundings.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB10	The proposed density is far in excess of surrounding areas.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB11	The proposed density is far in excess of surrounding areas.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB14	The proposed density is far in excess of surrounding areas.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB10	Questions the exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
996	JP	Threlfall	GB11	Questions the exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
996	JP	Threlfall	GB14	Questions the exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land. Contrary to WBC Core Strategy Policy CS24.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB10	The local infrastructure is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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 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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB11	The local infrastructure is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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>	
996	JP	Threlfall	GB14	The local infrastructure is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	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 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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB10	There is only a requirement to find sites for 550 dwellings.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB11	There is only a requirement to find sites for 550 dwellings.	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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB14	There is only a requirement to find sites for 550 dwellings.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
996	JP	Threlfall	GB10	Contrary to WBC Core Strategy Policy CS24.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 7.0.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						any future detailed planning application stage.	
996	JP	Threlfall	GB11	Contrary to WBC Core Strategy Policy CS24.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 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
996	JP	Threlfall	GB10	Object to the development of Green Belt. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl, maintain open space between WTC, Mayford and the CA surrounding Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
996	JP	Threlfall	GB11	Object to the development of Green Belt. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl, maintain open space between WTC, Mayford and the CA surrounding Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
996	JP	Threlfall	GB14	Object to the development of Green Belt. Goes against the purpose of the Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl, maintain open space between WTC, Mayford and the CA surrounding Hook Heath.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB12	Does not oppose the review of the GB but suggests that periodic reviews of the Green Belt should be reasonable with clear parameters and objectives.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB13	Does not oppose the review of the GB but suggests that periodic reviews of the Green Belt should be reasonable with clear parameters and objectives.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB12	The proposals are an inappropriate concentration and the local infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate further need. Too many houses will disrupt the balance.	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. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB13	The proposals are an inappropriate concentration and the local infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate further need. Too many houses will disrupt the balance.	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. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB12	Supports all sites except the site east of Upshot Lane. Sandy Lane is an ancient bridleway and visible from the Surrey hills AONB. There are also long distance views of the AONB from	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 landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				here. The eastern edge of the Pyrford site also needs careful consideration in this respect.		<p>policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features. This includes the retention of boundary planting, mature trees and tree belts.</p>	
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB13	Supports all sites except the site east of Upshot Lane. Sandy Lane is an ancient bridleway and visible from the Surrey hills AONB. There are also long distance views of the AONB from here. The eastern edge of the Pyrford site also needs careful consideration in this respect.	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 19.0 and 23.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features. This includes the retention of boundary planting, mature trees and tree belts.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB12	Supports WBC seeking independent advice and considers WBC rejection of advice given to be inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1363	Bob	Tilley	GB13	Supports WBC seeking independent advice and considers WBC rejection of advice given to be inappropriate.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0, 17.0 and 6.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	CIL is adopted and therefore all development already has to comply.	Development will be expected to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site" 	This is noted under the key requirements	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	The policy is unnecessarily restrictive in requiring a comprehensive development of this site and two neighbouring sites as a pre-requisite to the development of each site. The preparation of a development brief could stall development, provide uncertainty to the area and is not necessary to develop the wider area. The three sites are in different ownership and without third party a comprehensive development is unlikely. All sites are also currently subject to planning permission, applications or pre-application discussions with the Council and can be developed irrespective of a development brief. Therefore the SA DPD should be reworded.	"The redevelopment of the site must not prejudice the future development of neighbouring sites, particularly Proposal Site UA2 (Trizancia House) and Proposal Site	<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 or separately.</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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					UA4 (Kings Court)."		
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	There is no impediment to the site coming forward within the next 5 years and so the delivery arrangements in the SA DPD should encourage a shorter timeframe than given.	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	The site is within the urban area. The site proposal estimates when development will come forward but this does not preclude the site coming forward earlier.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	The allocation includes 21 criteria which repeat basic elements of good design principles, covered by other DPD policies, including CS21, and many are requirements of any planning application validation document.	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	The key requirements summarise the key issues that should be addressed in bringing the sites forward. These are not a substitute for Development Plan policies but rather a 'signpost' to relevant policies that will apply. The detail of the requirements will be set out in Development Plan policies in other documents. The purpose of the Site Allocation DPD is to establish the principle of development of the sites identified. Nevertheless, the Council will consider whether there is any unnecessary repetition under the key requirements and seek to avoid these.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	The allocation should be re-worded to clarify that either uses would be acceptable, either as a mix of the two or in isolation as a single use.	"This 0.15ha. site is allocated for offices and/or residential development"	The Council is allocating the site for mixed use development. The Site Allocation DPD seeks to deliver the requirements set out in the Core Strategy, including residential, office, warehouse and retail. The Council's approach is to locate commercial uses in the most sustainable locations, these are within designate centres, including Woking Town Centre, where this site is located.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. A development scheme should consider local and long distance views of the development;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"		
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. A Transport Statement may be required to assess likely transport impacts;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. A Travel Plan to minimise car use of prospective occupants of the development;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. An effective access arrangement to ensure highway safety;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					potential of the site"		
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Appropriate and adequate provision of car and cycle parking that takes into account the sites sustainable location and will not compromise on highway safety;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Building elevations should complement adjoining properties, provide appropriate levels of daylight and sunlight for internal environments and be of a high design quality that enhances the local and wider Town Centre character;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Building footprints should be of an appropriate scale to reflect the grain and character of adjacent development;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Building heights should consider the local and wider Town Centre context whilst ensuring there are no adverse environmental effects in terms of micro-climate, wind overshadowing and glare;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Building(s) should be designed to be adaptable or capable of being acceptable to allow scope for changes to be made to meet the needs of the occupier. Lifetime homes will be encouraged for the residential element of the development;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Comprehensive redevelopment to consider the context, including adjoining proposed allocated sites;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Contribution towards Affordable Housing provision in	Development will be expected to:	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				accordance with Policy CS12;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site" 	<p>The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required.</p> <p>The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.</p>	
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	<p>These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted.</p> <p>Contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring to mitigate the impacts of residential development of the site on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area;</p>	<p>Development will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site" 	<p>Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable.</p> <p>The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required.</p> <p>The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	<p>These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted.</p> <p>Development to meet relevant sustainable construction requirements at the time of planning application for the development of the site;</p>	<p>Development will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site" 	<p>Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable.</p> <p>The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required.</p> <p>The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	<p>These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted.</p> <p>Development to meet relevant Sustainable Drainage Systems requirements at the time of planning application for the development of the site;</p>	<p>Development will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provide good quality design of buildings 	<p>Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable.</p> <p>The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Due to the proximity of the road, the development would need to consider the impacts on noise and air quality and ensure mitigation measures are implemented to protect residential amenity.	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Servicing areas should be accommodated within the block;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Subject to technical feasibility and financial viability the development will be required to connect to the existing or proposed CHP network unless it can be demonstrated that a better alternative for reducing carbon emissions from the development can be achieved;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development 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
					street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Surface water flooding should be mitigated in the design of the development;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. The development should make improvements to the quality of the public realm;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. The development should retain any trees of value on the site;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"		
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. The storage of waste and recyclable materials should be incorporated into the design of the building to minimise street clutter;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	These key requirements are superfluous and should be deleted. Development should directly address the street scene on the ground floor to add interest and vibrancy to the street;	Development will be expected to: · Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and · Optimise the development potential of the site"	Although the key requirements can be found in other Development Plan Documents such as the Core Strategy, they set out the necessary requirements that need to be addressed in order for development to be acceptable. Therefore the Council believes that the key requirements in the DPD serve a purpose, are clear and are reasonable. The first proposed modification is already set out in the key requirements for the site and therefore it is considered that no further modification is required. The second proposed modification is noted. Nevertheless there should be a careful balance between optimising the development potential of the site and the impact of a development on adjacent buildings, street scene and heritage assets. Therefore although the Council agrees that the development of the site should optimise the development potential it should not compromise on its character and appearance and that of nearby areas. With this in mind, the Council does not intend to accept the proposed modification.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	The sub-text suggests that the there is a joint development agreement in place between Chester House and adjoining site. We are not aware of any joint development agreement and suggest that this reference is made in error and be removed.	Development will be expected to: Provide good quality design of buildings which relate to adjoining properties, the street scene and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; and	Reference to there being a joint developer agreement will be deleted.	Delete reference to a 'joint developer agreement'

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Optimise the development potential of the site"		
1022	Tania	Tindale	UA3	The policy is too prescriptive and could deter development coming forward.	None stated.	The Council's response is set out in detail under each specific heading,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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>	No further modification is 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.	
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	GB7	Object to proposal. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	GB9	Strongly object. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. Mayford will become a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of merging with Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	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	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
				settlement or retaining its character.			
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				allowed within 400m.			
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not 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> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
1651	J	Tobin	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	
1651	J	Tobin	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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	No further modification is 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.	
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	GB9	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	GB11	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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 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
1651	J	Tobin	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	No further modification is 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.	
1651	J	Tobin	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 Worpleston 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
1651	J	Tobin	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 Worpleston 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
1651	J	Tobin	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 Worpleston 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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1651	J	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				are 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.		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.	
1665	T	Tobin	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB10	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB11	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB7	Object to the proposal. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB8	Strongly object to the proposed leisure centre, running track and other facilities. These are inappropriate development	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	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
				within a residential area and do not meet the Council's own stated 800m separation policy.		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.	of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and</p>	No further modification is 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).	
1665	T	Tobin	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	GB8	The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people.	
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	GB8	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	GB10	The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues. There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. The TA also takes into account traffic displacement on local alternative routes.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment also acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	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	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		<p>proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. 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>	
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are no plans to upgrade the roads or bridges or any solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse. Houses can not be built without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure requirements has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1665	T	Tobin	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	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				without supporting infrastructure. The road to Worplesdon Station will be dangerous as there are no pavements. Saunders Lane is too narrow, vehicles speed along the road at present and houses are built up right to the road edge.		public transport where feasible.	
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	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
1665	T	Tobin	GB10	Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1665	T	Tobin	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
1406	Louise	Toms	GB12	Asks the Council to consider the ecological impact of building on these fields on wildlife.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1406	Louise	Toms	GB13	Asks the Council to consider the ecological impact of building on these fields on wildlife.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1406	Louise	Toms	GB12	Objects to the proposals. Pyrford is a charming, peaceful and beautiful place to live, with beautiful views and natural landscape.	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
1406	Louise	Toms	GB13	Objects to the proposals. Pyrford is a charming, peaceful and beautiful place to live, with beautiful views and natural landscape.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1406	Louise	Toms	GB12	Please help keep Pyrford a green and pleasant village.	Keep Pyrford a green and pleasant village.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1406	Louise	Toms	GB13	Please help keep Pyrford a green and pleasant village.	Keep Pyrford a green and pleasant village.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1406	Louise	Toms	GB12	The new houses will have a major effect on local road infrastructure, and worsen existing congestion. The country lanes were not designed to take current or massively increased traffic loads.	None stated.	This representation 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
1406	Louise	Toms	GB13	The new houses will have a major effect on local road infrastructure, and worsen existing congestion. The country lanes were not designed to take current or massively increased traffic loads.	None stated.	This representation 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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	WBC have not considered major housing development across the Borough boundary e.g. Wisley Airfield	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See paragraph 1.5 A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	WBC have not considered major housing development across the Borough boundary e.g. Wisley Airfield	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See paragraph 1.5 A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Highlights likely congestion south of Pyrford and on the Newark Bridges	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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Highlights likely congestion south of Pyrford and on the Newark Bridges	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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	The proposals are contrary to WBC Biodiversity Strategy	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	The proposals are contrary to WBC Biodiversity Strategy	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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	There is little available capacity within existing schools in the area. There should be evidence provided to demonstrate sufficient school provision to meet the additional needs	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	There is little available capacity within existing schools in the area. There should be evidence provided to demonstrate sufficient school provision to meet the additional needs	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate sufficient elderly care provision to meet the additional needs	None stated.	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate sufficient elderly care provision to meet the additional needs	None stated.	The draft Site Allocation DPD identifies sites to accommodate elderly housing provision in the borough. There are also sufficient and robust policies to ensure that proposals seek to address this particular need, including Core Strategy policy CS11 which seeks for a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address local needs as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) including housing for the elderly and CS13 which supports the development of specialist accommodation for older people and seeks the protection of existing.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate sufficient nursery and pre school provision to meet the additional needs	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate sufficient nursery and pre school provision to meet the additional needs	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate that safety issues will be considered.	None stated.	<p>Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable.</p> <p>The 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 the surrounding area, avoiding any significant harmful impact to the environment and general amenity.</p> <p>Further information on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 and 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Evidence should be provided to demonstrate that safety issues will be considered.	None stated.	Successful sustainable communities need careful planning, this is why the Council is seeking to address the growth in the borough through a plan led approach. It is the combination of the plan-making and development management process that will ensure that the development is truly sustainable.	No further modification is proposed 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 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 the surrounding area, avoiding any significant harmful impact to the environment and general amenity.</p> <p>Further information on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0 and 3.0</p>	
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	<p>WBC have departed from the recommendations of evidence in the GBBR. GB12 and GB13 are consistently assessed as not being suitable for release. GB13 is not considered suitable for residential development due to its open, exposed nature and its landscape designation Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance'.</p> <p>The GBBR is flawed. The GBBR discounts GB12 early on but reintroduces it later based on land availability.</p> <p>There is no reasonable justification for reintroducing GB12 and GB13 if there are other sites available with better credentials e.g. Parcel 7, 13, 2 and 28.</p> <p>The methodology is inconsistent, not all been subject to an equal and consistent assessment, with some sites being broken down into sub parcels and some not.</p> <p>Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.</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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	<p>WBC have departed from the recommendations of evidence in the GBBR. GB12 and GB13 are consistently assessed as not being suitable for release. GB13 is not considered suitable for residential development due to its open, exposed nature and its landscape designation Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance'.</p> <p>The GBBR is flawed. The GBBR discounts GB12 early on but reintroduces it later based on land availability.</p> <p>There is no reasonable justification for reintroducing GB12 and GB13 if there are other sites available with better credentials e.g. Parcel 7, 13, 2 and 28.</p> <p>The methodology is inconsistent, not all been subject to an equal and consistent assessment, with some sites being broken down into sub parcels and some not.</p> <p>Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.</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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	<p>There are inconsistencies between the SA and GBBR and the Site Allocation DPD. The Site Allocation alternates between the recommendations of the SA and the GBBR. This creates an unsound evidence base and inconsistencies in the assessment methodology process. Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.</p>	None stated.	<p>It is inevitable that there will be some differences between the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The Council is confident that a robust and consistent approach has been applied and sound judgements made in identifying suitable sites.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10, Section 17.0, Section 8.0</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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	There are inconsistencies between the SA and GBBR and the Site Allocation DPD. The Site Allocation alternates between the recommendations of the SA and the GBBR. This creates an unsound evidence base and inconsistencies in the assessment methodology process. Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.	None stated.	It is inevitable that there will be some differences between the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR). The Council is confident that a robust and consistent approach has been applied and sound judgements made in identifying suitable sites. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10, Section 17.0, Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	WBC chose to defer any action on the PNF letter and proceeded to approve the DPD even with unanswered questions about Pyrford issues. Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.	None stated.	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. 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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	WBC chose to defer any action on the PNF letter and proceeded to approve the DPD even with unanswered questions about Pyrford issues. Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.	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 the minutes are available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	The character of Pyrford and the surrounding landscape and views are important. Do you agree?	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 landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	The character of Pyrford and the surrounding landscape and views are important. Do you agree?	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 landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views. The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Pyrford has a range of well maintained heritage assets that will be adversely affected. Do you agree?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Pyrford has a range of well maintained heritage assets that will be adversely affected. Do you agree?	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0 and 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Congestion is already a problem in Pyrford and the addition of 433 new houses will result in permanent gridlock. Please advise that the various points listed have been considered The impact on B367.Upshot Lane? The impact on natural resources/ tree clearance. How will TPOs be dealt with? Consideration given to a potential roundabout junction that will require a large diameter? Pedestrian access/ footway provision to the site.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshot 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	<p>Congestion is already a problem in Pyrford and the addition of 433 new houses will result in permanent gridlock. Please advise that the various points listed have been considered</p> <p>The impact on B367.Upshot Lane?</p> <p>The impact on natural resources/ tree clearance. How will TPOs be dealt with?</p> <p>Consideration given to a potential roundabout junction that will require a large diameter?</p> <p>Pedestrian access/ footway provision to the site.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>The key requirements also note that proposals should conduct landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Given the existing traffic/highways congestion, are you satisfied that the area can cope with 1000 additional vehicles?	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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Given the existing traffic/highways congestion, are you satisfied that the area can cope with 1000 additional vehicles?	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
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Object to proposals in Pyrford. WBC have ignored letters submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum (PNF) raising concern about the GBBR and how it was applied to the Site Allocation DPD. The letter set out that the evidence base was not robust. At the Executive meeting 4 June WBC drew attention to but chose not to review the representations of the letter but were of the view that the draft Site Allocations DPD was "based on robust evidence". Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.	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 the minutes are available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Object to proposals in Pyrford. WBC have ignored letters submitted by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum (PNF) raising concern about the GBBR and how it was applied to the Site Allocation DPD. The letter set out that the evidence base was not robust. At the Executive meeting 4 June WBC drew attention to but chose not to review the representations of the letter but were of the view that the draft Site Allocations DPD was "based on robust evidence". Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.	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 the minutes are available online.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	There are conflicts between the GBBR recommendations, Sustainability Appraisal and Site Allocation DPD. GB13 is consistently identified as unsuitable in the GBBR yet it is being considered in the Site Allocation DPD as a safeguarded site for 2027-2040. Parcel 7 is rejected by the SA but considered suitable as a safeguarded site in the GBBR. WBC have rejected GBBR recommendations for the rationalisation of the GB. The SA should review all sites but does not appear to assess sites within Parcel 31, which the GBBR has assessed to be more suitable than Parcel 9. Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.	The SA should assess sites within Parcel 31, which were considered more suitable than sites in	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. The combined information from the substantial evidence base provide a sufficient basis to make informed judgements about the proposed allocation	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	There are conflicts between the GBBR recommendations, Sustainability Appraisal and Site Allocation DPD. GB13 is consistently identified as unsuitable in the GBBR yet it is being considered in the Site Allocation DPD as a safeguarded site for 2027-2040. Parcel 7 is rejected by the SA but considered suitable as a safeguarded site in the GBBR. WBC have rejected GBBR recommendations for the rationalisation of the GB. The SA should review all sites but does not appear to assess sites within Parcel 31, which the GBBR has assessed to be more suitable than Parcel 9. Warn that proceeding with the DPD will be met with legal challenge.	The SA should assess sites within Parcel 31, which were considered more suitable than sites in	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. The combined information from the substantial evidence base provide a sufficient basis to make informed judgements about the proposed allocation	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB12	Appreciate the need to build more houses to meet the needs of the growing population, however considers the proposals	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	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 Pyrford to be wholly inappropriate. The recommendation to bring forward GB12 and GB13 are fundamentally flawed and will result in a legal challenge. Is this an appropriate use of public fun?		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 (see Section 8.0 the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) suggests that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Please also see Section 6.0. The Council is satisfied that sufficient consultation has been done within the available resources and in line with the Statement of Community Involvement document. The Council will publish a legal compliance and tests of soundness statement in due course as part of the submission documents to the Secretary of State to demonstrate that the legal and procedural requirements and the tests of soundness have also been met	of this representation
1362	Rod	Tonna-Barthet	GB13	Appreciate the need to build more houses to meet the needs of the growing population, however considers the proposals for Pyrford to be wholly inappropriate. The recommendation to bring forward GB12 and GB13 are fundamentally flawed and will result in a legal challenge. Is this an appropriate use of public fun?	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 (see Section 8.0 the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper) suggests that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. Please also see Section 6.0. The Council is satisfied that sufficient consultation has been done within the available resources and in line with the Statement of Community Involvement document. The Council will publish a legal compliance and tests of soundness statement in due course as part of the submission documents to the Secretary of State to demonstrate that the legal and procedural requirements and the tests of soundness have also been met	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB12	Its not just two fields that would be lost but due to traffic impacts, the community vibe that makes Pyrford special would be destroyed.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Pyrford Common Road and/or Upshott Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB13	Its not just two fields that would be lost but due to traffic impacts, the community vibe that makes Pyrford special would be destroyed.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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>	
642	Lisa	Topper	GB12	Woking should be fighting against increased housing, otherwise it will be in danger of becoming an overrun city. New towns should be built with properly planned roads and infrastructure, rather than gridlocking roads in Woking, which can not be addressed without bulldozing houses to widen roads, which defeats the objects	Suggests development of new towns, with properly planned roads and infrastructure, rather than the developments proposed in Pyrford and West Byfleet.	Comment noted and the new town concept is being taken forward in some locations across the country, to meet demand in those areas. However, this does not negate the need for the Council to meet its housing requirement, as set in the Core Strategy, highlighted at the start of the draft DPD and in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, infrastructure can be planned for to support development (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The Council's evidence also suggests that the sites in Pyrford are in sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives (see Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB13	Woking should be fighting against increased housing, otherwise it will be in danger of becoming an overrun city. New towns should be built with properly planned roads and infrastructure, rather than gridlocking roads in Woking, which can not be addressed without bulldozing houses to widen roads, which defeats the objects	Suggests development of new towns, with properly planned roads and infrastructure, rather than the developments proposed in Pyrford and West Byfleet.	Comment noted and the new town concept is being taken forward in some locations across the country, to meet demand in those areas. However, this does not negate the need for the Council to meet its housing requirement, as set in the Core Strategy, highlighted at the start of the draft DPD and in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, infrastructure can be planned for to support development (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The Council's evidence also suggests that the sites in Pyrford are in sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives (see Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB15	Woking should be fighting against increased housing, otherwise it will be in danger of becoming an overrun city. New towns should be built with properly planned roads and infrastructure, rather than gridlocking roads in Woking, which can not be addressed without bulldozing houses to widen roads, which defeats the objects	Suggests development of new towns, with properly planned roads and infrastructure, rather than the developments proposed in Pyrford and West Byfleet.	Comment noted and the new town concept is being taken forward in some locations across the country, to meet demand in those areas. However, this does not negate the need for the Council to meet its housing requirement, as set in the Core Strategy, highlighted at the start of the draft DPD and in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, infrastructure can be planned for to support development (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The Council's evidence also suggests that the sites in West Byfleet are in sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives (see Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB16	Woking should be fighting against increased housing, otherwise it will be in danger of becoming an overrun city. New towns should be built with properly planned roads and infrastructure, rather than gridlocking roads in Woking, which can not be addressed without bulldozing houses to widen roads, which defeats the objects	Suggests development of new towns, with properly planned roads and infrastructure,	Comment noted and the new town concept is being taken forward in some locations across the country, to meet demand in those areas. However, this does not negate the need for the Council to meet its housing requirement, as set in the Core Strategy, highlighted at the start of the draft DPD and in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Furthermore, infrastructure can be planned for to support development (see Section 3.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper). The Council's evidence also suggests that the sites in West Byfleet are in sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives (see Section 9.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					rather than the developments proposed in Pyrford and West Byfleet.		
642	Lisa	Topper	GB12	It [significantly increased traffic from development] would destroy the peaceful and idyllic Green Belt setting.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB13	It [significantly increased traffic from development] would destroy the peaceful and idyllic Green Belt setting.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB15	It [significantly increased traffic from development] would destroy the peaceful and idyllic Green Belt setting.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB16	It [significantly increased traffic from development] would destroy the peaceful and idyllic Green Belt setting.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 7.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB12	Moved to Pyrford due to the Green Belt, countryside and beauty of the area. This should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors. It should not be built on and polluted by additional traffic.	The Green Belt should not be built on and should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors.	The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet development need beyond the plan period is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. This is further outlined in Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Traffic and transport infrastructure is covered in Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB13	Moved to Pyrford due to the Green Belt, countryside and beauty of the area. This should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors. It should not be built on and polluted by additional traffic.	The Green Belt should not be built on and should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors.	The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet development need beyond the plan period is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. This is further outlined in Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Traffic and transport infrastructure is covered in Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB15	The Green Belt, countryside and beauty of the area should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors. It should not be built on and polluted by additional traffic.	The Green Belt should not be built on and should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors.	The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet development need beyond the plan period is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. This is further outlined in Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Traffic and transport infrastructure is covered in Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB16	The Green Belt, countryside and beauty of the area should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors. It should not be built on and polluted by additional traffic.	The Green Belt should not be built on and should be protected for the enjoyment of future residents and visitors.	The justification for releasing Green Belt land for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet development need beyond the plan period is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0. The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. This is further outlined in Sections 21.0 and 23.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Traffic and transport infrastructure is covered in Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.6 and 3.11, of this paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB12	The proposal would increase the number of families and therefore the need for school places. Pyrford cannot meet this need, so asks where the school places will be that won't require yet more cars on the road to take children to school.	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
642	Lisa	Topper	GB13	The proposal would increase the number of families and therefore the need for school places. Pyrford cannot meet this need, so asks where the school places will be that won't	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				require yet more cars on the road to take children to school.			
642	Lisa	Topper	GB15	The proposal would increase the number of families and therefore the need for school places. Pyrford cannot meet this need, so asks where the school places will be that won't require yet more cars on the road to take children to school.	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
642	Lisa	Topper	GB16	The proposal would increase the number of families and therefore the need for school places. Pyrford cannot meet this need, so asks where the school places will be that won't require yet more cars on the road to take children to school.	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
642	Lisa	Topper	GB12	Development in Pyrford and further proposals in the area, at Wisley Airfield and in West Byfleet will have a significant impact on already congested roads, particularly at peaks times. Pyrford's is located between the A£, Woking town centre, M25 and West Byfleet and any additional houses will increase traffic problems and make it an unpleasant, unviable place to live. Some roads are single lane and could not cope with increased 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
642	Lisa	Topper	GB13	Development in Pyrford and further proposals in the area, at Wisley Airfield and in West Byfleet will have a significant impact on already congested roads, particularly at peaks times. Pyrford's is located between the A£, Woking town centre, M25 and West Byfleet and any additional houses will increase traffic problems and make it an unpleasant, unviable place to live. Some roads are single lane and could not cope with increased 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
642	Lisa	Topper	GB15	Development in Pyrford and further proposals in the area, at Wisley Airfield and in West Byfleet will have a significant impact on already congested roads, particularly at peaks times. Pyrford's is located between the A£, Woking town centre, M25 and West Byfleet and any additional houses will increase traffic problems and make it an unpleasant, unviable place to live. Some roads are single lane and could not cope with increased 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
642	Lisa	Topper	GB16	Development in Pyrford and further proposals in the area, at Wisley Airfield and in West Byfleet will have a significant impact on already congested roads, particularly at peaks times. Pyrford's is located between the A£, Woking town centre, M25 and West Byfleet and any additional houses will increase traffic problems and make it an unpleasant, unviable place to live. Some roads are single lane and could not cope with increased 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
642	Lisa	Topper	GB12	Concerned about the effect of large development at the top of a hill on water run off and flood risk to Pyrford residents.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB13	Concerned about the effect of large development at the top of a hill on water run off and flood risk to Pyrford residents.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB15	Concerned about the effect of large development at the top of a hill on water run off and flood risk to Pyrford residents.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
642	Lisa	Topper	GB16	Concerned about the effect of large development at the top of a hill on water run off and flood risk to Pyrford residents.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB8	Development of the sites in Mayford will put further strain on the A320 which already can not cope. The existing congestion is already unsustainable. What evidence is there that the proposals won't have a catastrophic impact on the road network in the area.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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>	
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB11	<p>Flooding issues are prevalent along Saunders Lane. Stranding surface water can also lead to various hazards including on the road.</p> <p>The area around Saunders Lane is also covered with ditches, streams.</p> <p>The topography and soil structure of the area makes it vulnerable to flooding.</p> <p>Given the amount of money spent by WBC on the Hoe Valley FAS, it is surprising to see a proposal that would increase flood risk just a mile down the road</p>	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>The site proposal also includes a list of key requirements that need to be addressed before the site comes forward. This includes a need for a Flood Risk Assessment for the site to include appropriate mitigation measures to address existing and future flood risk.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB10	<p>The site has been used for producing biofuels for a few years.</p> <p>There are issues with water run off from the site onto the road and surrounding properties.</p> <p>The surrounding roads, including Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane are narrow and inadequate to accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>Smarts Heath road is congested at rush hour,</p> <p>The road under the bridge by Worplesdon Station is inadequate and impassable in certain weather conditions. Making it unsafe to use.</p>	None stated.	<p>The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land by DEFRA.</p> <p>With regards to flooding and water run off, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0.</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
1280	Margaret	Treanor	General	The character of Mayford is diverse, with a mixture of building styles and age and a vibrant community. The area has so far, been able to retain its sense of place and rurality.	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 special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>It is also emphasised that the requirements of the Core Strategy, in particular, Policy CS24: Woking's landscape and townscape will apply to any proposal that would come forward to develop the allocated sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	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. Please reconsider plans	None stated.	<p>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</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
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB11	Concerned that Mayford will become just another suburb of Woking. The area does not have adequate infrastructure to accommodate growth.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, 15.0, 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB7	An increase in Traveller pitches will threaten ecology and local wildlife particularly in the adjoining SSSI	None stated.	<p>The Council agrees with the above, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB11	The proposals will have devastating impact on the environment, resident properties and local businesses	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 20.0 and 24.0.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that that the DPD is adequately and appropriately informed by robust and up-to-date evidence base (the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 8.0) , and a Sustainability Appraisal. The proposed site allocations also include a list of key requirements that need to be met for sites to come forward.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements make sure that the development of the site are sustainable compared against the reasonable alternatives.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB11	Appreciates the efforts to provide housing in the Borough to meet ever growing housing needs. However, believes the efforts have resulted in high levels of apartments and not enough family homes. It is suspected that some of the apartments are sitting empty as they are overpriced	None stated.	Policy CS11 requires development proposals to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes to address the local need set out in the latest SHMA. The appropriate percentage mix will also depend on the establish character of and density of the surrounding area. The Council is satisfied that this, combined with other requirements will ensure sustainable and balanced communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB7	Believes that Mayford already makes a major contribution towards the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion here	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB8	The A320 is an important link between two principle areas Woking and Guildford. Both have good rail links, and Guildford has the status of a cathedral city and positive status in IT industry. Movement between the two areas is important however the route is often congested particularly at Mayford roundabout, which is used as a through route when the A3/M25 is blocked	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB11	<p>The escarpment is highly valued and well loved series of fields that have been enjoyed as a local amenity for years.</p> <p>The escarpment provides a habitat for numerous species including badgers, deer, foxes, native reptiles, all play a part in the wider ecosystem.</p> <p>The geology of the area is largely Bagshot Sand on clay, this restricts the amount of water absorbing into the ground and causing surface water flooding.</p>	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 7.0, 23.0 and 21.0. Most of the proposed allocations were considered to have capacity to accommodate change based on the landscape character as assessed in the Green Belt Boundary review. In addition, the Council is confident that there are sufficient and robust policies including Core Strategy policy CS24 and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposals for the development take a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated, including the conservation and enhancement of important views.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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 landscape assessment/ecological survey/ tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the 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>With regards to comments about flooding, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper see Section 5.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1280	Margaret	Treanor	GB11	There is already significant congestion in and around the area. Road improvement works encourage rat running on other roads	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6, 20.0 and 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
963	Mark	Trinder	GB12	<p>Object to development proposals on the Green Belt in Pyrford.</p> <p>The primary school has twice been expanded without associated infrastructure improvements such as parking and road widening. This has led to delays and dangerous incidents.</p>	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Local Planning Authority would recommend that the existing parking issues noted in the representation are highlighted to Woking Borough Council Parking Services as well as Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that</p>	No further modification is proposed 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>	
963	Mark	Trinder	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals on the Green Belt in Pyrford.</p> <p>The primary school has twice been expanded without associated infrastructure improvements such as parking and road widening. This has led to delays and dangerous incidents.</p>	None stated.	<p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education needs to support the Core Strategy. It is satisfied that the combination of expanding capacity at existing schools and the allocation of the specific site for a secondary school in the DPD will meet the education needs of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Local Planning Authority would recommend that the existing parking issues noted in the representation are highlighted to Woking Borough Council Parking Services as well as Surrey County Council who are the Highways Authority for the Borough.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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
963	Mark	Trinder	GB12	<p>Object to development proposals on the Green Belt as it causes the loss of separation of areas. Greater emphasis should be given to development on brownfield sites or</p>	None stated.	<p>The use of Brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				extending existing sites.		<p>The issue of the Green Belt providing physical separation between settlements is comprehensively addressed in Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p> <p>The issue of the amenity use of the Green Belt has been comprehensively been addressed in Section 21.0.</p>	
963	Mark	Trinder	GB13	Object to development proposals on the Green Belt as it causes the loss of separation of areas. Greater emphasis should be given to development on brownfield sites or extending existing sites.	None stated.	<p>The use of Brownfield sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.</p> <p>The issue of the Green Belt providing physical separation between settlements is comprehensively addressed in Section 12.0.</p> <p>The proposed allocation will not reduce the gap between Woking and Guildford. It is noted however that it will reduce the gap between Woking and Mayford. By retaining the Green Belt between Mayford and Guildford, it will continue to perform a significant role in maintaining separation between the town and Guildford.</p> <p>The issue of the amenity use of the Green Belt has been comprehensively been addressed in Section 21.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	General	Green Belt development will be most profitable for builders and property companies which is ethically unprofitable for residents.	None stated.	This is not a material planning consideration.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB4	Green Belt development will be most profitable for builders and property companies which is ethically unprofitable for residents.	None stated.	This is not a material planning consideration.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB5	Green Belt development will be most profitable for builders and property companies which is ethically unprofitable for residents.	None stated.	This is not a material planning consideration.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	General	Houses building does not justify exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB4	Houses building does not justify exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB5	Houses building does not justify exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB4	Local infrastructure including schools and medical facilities are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse to the detriment of residents.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB5	Local infrastructure including schools and medical facilities are already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse to the detriment of residents.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1052	Steve	Trippit	General	Objects to releasing Green Belt, development should only occur on Brownfield land.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has carried out a review of brownfield sites within the Borough. This is further set out 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB4	Objects to releasing Green Belt, development should only occur on Brownfield land.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. In addition, the Council has carried out a review of brownfield sites within the Borough. This is further set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB5	Objects to releasing Green Belt, development should only occur on Brownfield land.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. In addition, the Council has carried out a review of brownfield sites within the Borough. This is further set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1052	Steve	Trippit	General	Green Belt land is used for leisure activities.	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
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB4	Green Belt land is used for leisure activities.	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
1052	Steve	Trippit	GB5	Green Belt land is used for leisure activities.	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
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB4	The proposed area has previously 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
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB5	The proposed area has previously 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
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB4	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB5	The Byfleet Petition with some 2,500 names has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB4	The current infrastructure is at capacity and must be rectified before development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB5	The current infrastructure is at capacity and must be rectified before development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1693	Clifford	Tully	General	Green Belt must be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB4	The A245 will become unusable and Byfleet 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 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
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB5	The A245 will become unusable and Byfleet 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	No further modification is proposed 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 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>	
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB4	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1693	Clifford	Tully	GB5	The proposal would remove most of Byfleet's Green Belt whilst most of Woking's Green Belt remains.	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
777	Amanda	Tumini	GB12	Objects to Green Belt development proposals. The area is congested and traffic is 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The 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>	
777	Amanda	Tumini	GB13	Objects to Green Belt development proposals. The area is congested and traffic is 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> <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
777	Amanda	Tumini	GB12	The area will not be able to support a large increase in population. Not enough parking spaces at the shops, doctors, etc. Hope you listen to the objections.	None stated.	<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 are also within walking and cycling distance of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre, which caters for the day to day needs of local people. Therefore the need to travel by car to the local shops and doctors is reduced due to the location of the proposed allocations.</p> <p>The representations received during the Regulation 18 consultation have all been considered and responded to individually. The Regulation 19 consultation will present a further opportunity to express opinions on the DPD as well as at the Examination in Public which is due to take place in 2017.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
777	Amanda	Tumini	GB13	The area will not be able to support a large increase in population. Not enough parking spaces at the shops, doctors, etc. Hope you listen to the objections.	None stated.	<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 are also within walking and cycling distance of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre, which caters for the day to day needs of local people. Therefore the need to travel by car to the local shops and doctors is reduced due to the location of the proposed allocations.</p> <p>The representations received during the Regulation 18 consultation have all been considered and responded to individually. The Regulation 19 consultation will present a further opportunity to express opinions on the DPD as well as at the Examination in Public which is due to take place in 2017.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
64	Amanda	Turner	GB12	Not a good idea to build an additional 400+ homes in an area with infrastructure already creaking at the seams. The local Primary school (Pyrford Primary) has already introduced additional classes per year group, there are plans to rebuild the school to make it bigger.	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 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
64	Amanda	Turner	GB12	Traffic and parking at school collection and drop off times is extremely heavy and almost impossible with this additional class let alone the new classes that will be introduced when the school has been built. Many children come by car from Woking areas, it is almost impossible to drive down Coldharbour Road at these times. There have been 2 very serious car accidents in recent months at the junction of Engliff Lane and Upshott Lane due to the amount of traffic. In the morning at 7.30am it is not uncommon to sit at the junction of Elmstead Road and Old Woking Road for 20 mins before being able to get out. This situation is almost unrecognisable from West Byfleet 13 years ago.	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. Suggestions of parking violations and/or provision of public parking will be reported to the relevant Sections of the Council.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
64	Amanda	Turner	GB12	Many old houses have been pulled down and developed with apartments or multiple houses. The development of houses and apartments at Oakfield School will impact the infrastructure. Doctor surgeries are at their maximum, it is almost impossible to get an appointment. My mother-in Law has to have regular hospital appointments and is waiting months to be seen.	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. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
64	Amanda	Turner	GB12	Area has always been a village community - there is a strong community spirit in Pyrford with the church and school being the centre, son plays cricket in the summer at Pyrford cricket. At the minimum, the community spirit will be totally destroyed.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the general character of the area will be destroyed as suggested. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt including preventing neighbouring town from merging into one another and are satisfied that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will not be compromised. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. It is important to note that the Council has a responsibility to plan to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
64	Amanda	Turner	GB12	Infrastructure will be severely impacted - ask you to reconsider your plans for the 400+ houses. The plans for Wisley airfield will already impact Pyrford/Wisley and surrounding areas and infrastructure. Pyrford will not survive if these houses are built - becoming a town, totally	Reconsider your plans for the 400+ houses.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				unrecognisable from the village it once was.		development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. As part of meeting the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with its neighbouring authorities to make sure that development impacts of cross boundary significance are addressed. The Council will ensure that development outside the borough will not have unacceptable impacts with the area.	
64	Amanda	Turner	GB13	Not a good idea to build an additional 400+ homes in an area with infrastructure already creaking at the seams. The local Primary school (Pyrford Primary) has already introduced additional classes per year group, there are plans to rebuild the school to make it bigger.	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
64	Amanda	Turner	GB13	Traffic and parking at school collection and drop off times is extremely heavy and almost impossible with this additional class let alone the new classes that will be introduced when the school has been built. Many children come by car from Woking areas, it is almost impossible to drive down Coldharbour Road at these times. There have been 2 very serious car accidents in recent months at the junction of Engliff Lane and Upshott Lane due to the amount of traffic. In the morning at 7.30am it is not uncommon to sit at the junction of Elmstead Road and Old Woking Road for 20 mins before being able to get out. This situation is almost unrecognisable from West Byfleet 13 years ago.	None stated.	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development needs of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the future is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the infrastructure needed to support the development. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
64	Amanda	Turner	GB13	Many old houses have been pulled down and developed with apartments or multiple houses. The development of houses and apartments at Oakfield School will impact the infrastructure. Doctor surgeries are at their maximum, it is almost impossible to get an appointment. My mother-in Law has to have regular hospital appointments and is waiting months to be seen.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area. The Council has relied on a range of evidence to inform the DPD. Collectively, they support and justifies the allocation of the proposed sites.	
64	Amanda	Turner	GB13	Area has always been a village community - there is a strong community spirit in Pyrford with the church and school being the centre, son plays cricket in the summer at Pyrford cricket. At the minimum, the community spirit will be totally destroyed.	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. Overall it is not expected that community spirit will be destroyed as a result of the proposal.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
64	Amanda	Turner	GB13	Infrastructure will be severely impacted - ask you to reconsider your plans for the 400+ houses. The plans for Wisley airfield will already impact Pyrford/Wisley and surrounding areas and infrastructure. Pyrford will not survive if these houses are built - becoming a town, totally unrecognisable from the village it once was.	Reconsider your plans for the 400+ houses.	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
103	Gloria	Turner	GB12	I am 80, live alone and have lived here for several years to be near my family in West Byfleet/Pyrford. I have enjoyed the community spirit amongst Pyrford. I live on the Coldharbour Road opposite Pyrford shops and have noticed the amount of traffic has increased since I moved here. There have been several near-misses of accidents at school pick up and drop off times. I am quite sure one day I will have the misfortune to see a very serious accident which could involve a child. The parking is almost impossible.	I implore you to reconsider this development.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the Council has been working with the County Council to fully assess the traffic implications of the proposals. In addition to strategic transport measures, measures will also be developed as part of the site specific requirements to mitigate against the traffic impacts of the proposals. 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
103	Gloria	Turner	GB12	I also moved here to be in Great Belt land - this is to restrict the sprawl of built up areas - should you build 400 houses at the end of my road this will become a sprawling built up area where neighbouring towns are merged into each other. There will be no countryside in this area - those fields at the end of Upshott Lane are the only patch of countryside. Another specific from Green Belt land is to preserve the character/community of historic towns/villages - this will be totally destroyed.	I implore you to reconsider this development.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. This are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
103	Gloria	Turner	GB12	As an elderly person I have to visit the doctors/hospitals - I already find it difficult to get appointments. What would happen when there are over 400 more homes in the area? I implore you to reconsider this development.	I implore you to reconsider this development.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
103	Gloria	Turner	GB13	I am 80, live alone and have lived here for several years to be near my family in West Byfleet/Pyrford. I have enjoyed the community spirit amongst Pyrford. I live on the Coldharbour Road opposite Pyrford shops and have noticed the amount of traffic has increased since I moved here. There have been several near-misses of accidents at school pick up and drop off times. I am quite sure one day I will have the misfortune to see a very serious accident which could involve a child. The parking is almost impossible.	I implore you to reconsider this development.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Overall, the Council has been working with the County Council to fully assess the traffic implications of the proposals. In addition to strategic transport measures, measures will also be developed as part of the site specific requirements to mitigate against the traffic impacts of the proposals. 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
103	Gloria	Turner	GB13	I also moved here to be in Great Belt land - this is to restrict the sprawl of built up areas - should you build 400 houses at the end of my road this will become a sprawling built up area where neighbouring towns are merged into each other. There will be no countryside in this area - those fields at the end of Upshott Lane are the only patch of countryside. Another specific from Green Belt land is to preserve the character/community of historic towns/villages - this will be totally destroyed.	I implore you to reconsider this development.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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
103	Gloria	Turner	GB13	As an elderly person I have to visit the doctors/hospitals - I already find it difficult to get appointments. What would happen when there are over 400 more homes in the area? I implore you to reconsider this development.	I implore you to reconsider this development.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Hospitals traditionally has responded to the needs of the population.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB4	Strong opposition to the proposed developments in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB4	As a resident for 13 years- they have witnessed the intensification of family homes to apartments and multiple units	None stated.	Comment noted. 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB4	Development of the GB is contrary to Government proposals, It will lead to the merging of neighbouring towns/villages into suburbs of Woking- destroying their unique character	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB4	An additional 1000+ homes will destroy GB land	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. T	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB4	An additional 1000+ homes will put an impossible amount of strain on the road network and public services	None stated.	The general approach to dealing with the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
114	Philip	Turner	GB4	Oppose the proposals for the area and highlight it is a view shared by every resident in the area. Believe the proposals will completely ruin the area.	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 sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals have been fully assessed. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the proposals will not significantly compromise the character of the area. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses this matter in detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB5	Strong opposition to the proposed developments in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB5	As a resident for 13 years- they have witnessed the intensification of family homes to apartments and multiple units	None stated.	Comment noted. 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB5	Development of the GB is contrary to Government proposals, It will lead to the merging of neighbouring towns/villages into suburbs of Woking- destroying their unique character	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB5	An additional 1000+ homes will destroy GB land	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB5	An additional 1000+ homes will put an impossible amount of strain on the road network and public services	None stated.	The general approach to dealing with the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB5	Oppose the proposals for the area and highlight it is a view shared by every resident in the area. Believe the proposals will completely ruin the area.	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 sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals have been fully assessed. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the proposals will not significantly compromise the character of the area. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses this matter in detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB12	Strong opposition to the proposed developments in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet	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	No further modification is 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 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.	
114	Philip	Turner	GB12	As a resident for 13 years- they have witnessed the intensification of family homes to apartments and multiple units	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB12	Development of the GB is contrary to Government proposals, It will lead to the merging of neighbouring towns/villages into suburbs of Woking- destroying their unique character	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB12	An additional 1000+ homes will destroy GB land	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB12	An additional 1000+ homes will put an impossible amount of strain on the road network and public services	None stated.	The general approach to dealing with the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB12	Oppose the proposals for the area and highlight it is a view shared by every resident in the area. Believe the proposals will completely ruin the area.	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 sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals have been fully assessed. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the proposals will not significantly compromise the character of the area. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses this matter in detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB13	Strong opposition to the proposed developments in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB13	As a resident for 13 years- they have witnessed the intensification of family homes to apartments and multiple units	None stated.	Comment noted. 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB13	Development of the GB is contrary to Government proposals, It will lead to the merging of neighbouring towns/villages into suburbs of Woking- destroying their unique character	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
114	Philip	Turner	GB13	An additional 1000+ homes will destroy GB land	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB13	An additional 1000+ homes will put an impossible amount of strain on the road network and public services	None stated.	The general approach to dealing with the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB13	Oppose the proposals for the area and highlight it is a view shared by every resident in the area. Believe the proposals will completely ruin the area.	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 sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals have been fully assessed. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the proposals will not significantly compromise the character of the area. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses this matter in detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB15	Strong opposition to the proposed developments in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB15	As a resident for 13 years- they have witnessed the intensification of family homes to apartments and multiple units	None stated.	Comment noted. 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB15	Development of the GB is contrary to Government proposals, It will lead to the merging of neighbouring towns/villages into suburbs of Woking- destroying their unique character	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Woking and other towns such as Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB15	An additional 1000+ homes will destroy GB land	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB15	An additional 1000+ homes will put an impossible amount of strain on the road network and public services	None stated.	The general approach to dealing with the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
114	Philip	Turner	GB15	Oppose the proposals for the area and highlight it is a view shared by every resident in the area. Believe the proposals will completely ruin the area.	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 sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals have been fully assessed. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the proposals will not significantly compromise the character of the area. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses this matter in detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB16	Strong opposition to the proposed developments in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet	None stated.	The justification of the release of Green Belt land in Pyrford, Byfleet and West Byfleet is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
114	Philip	Turner	GB16	As a resident for 13 years- they have witnessed the intensification of family homes to apartments and multiple units	None stated.	Comment noted. 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB16	Development of the GB is contrary to Government proposals, It will lead to the merging of neighbouring towns/villages into suburbs of Woking- destroying their unique character	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB16	An additional 1000+ homes will destroy GB land	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
114	Philip	Turner	GB16	An additional 1000+ homes will put an impossible amount of strain on the road network and public services	None stated.	The general approach to dealing with the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals 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
114	Philip	Turner	GB16	Oppose the proposals for the area and highlight it is a view shared by every resident in the area. Believe the proposals will completely ruin the area.	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 sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals have been fully assessed. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the proposals will not significantly compromise the character of the area. Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses this matter in detail.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Light pollution - the haze of flood lights can be seen for many miles.	None stated.	The school and leisure centre proposal now has planning permission	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Erosion of Green Belt - we are nearing a situation of continuous structures between Woking and 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. It is not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Woking 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
				resulting in Mayford losing its identity.		Guilford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Poor infrastructure that cannot sustain the volume of traffic generated - Egley Road is already heavily congested during rush hours. The school will create several hundred traffic movements coinciding with these, the situation will become untenable and create a substantial increase in exhaust fumes.	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Flooding - existing flooding at entrance to Woking Garden Centre, this will deteriorate.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Noise - the running track will create high noise levels during any competition.	None stated.	The school and leisure centre proposal now has planning permission	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Lack of a full environmental impact assessment (with planning application).	None stated.	The Council has carried out a Sustainability Appraisal to include Strategic Environmental Assessment to inform the DPD. In addition, there are other environmentally related studies such as Transport and Landscape Assessment that has been carried out to support the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	Can Surrey County Council afford the new infrastructure and environmental damage (roads, bridges, lighting, sewage, water, services, flood prevention, exhaust emissions from stationary vehicles) if the proposed development were to go ahead?	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. Flooding issues are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Can Surrey County Council afford the new infrastructure and environmental damage (roads, bridges, lighting, sewage, water, services, flood prevention, exhaust emissions from stationary vehicles) if the proposed development were to go ahead?	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
						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	
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	Can Surrey County Council afford the new infrastructure and environmental damage (roads, bridges, lighting, sewage, water, services, flood prevention, exhaust emissions from stationary vehicles) if the proposed development were to go ahead?	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	Can Surrey County Council afford the new infrastructure and environmental damage (roads, bridges, lighting, sewage, water, services, flood prevention, exhaust emissions from stationary vehicles) if the proposed development were to go ahead?	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 it states routes enjoyed by the public for 20 years or more as a right are deemed to have been dedicated as a highway. Paths along the escarpment run the length of Saunders Lane.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 it states routes enjoyed by the public for 20 years or more as a right are deemed to have been dedicated as a highway. Paths along the escarpment run the length of Saunders Lane.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 it states routes enjoyed by the public for 20 years or more as a right are deemed to have been dedicated as a highway. Paths along the escarpment run the length of Saunders Lane.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 it states routes enjoyed by the public for 20 years or more as a right are deemed to have been dedicated as a highway. Paths along the escarpment run the length of Saunders Lane.	None stated.	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	HGVs currently cannot pass near Emmanuel Church, Saunders Lane, without mounting the pavement.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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. As part of Transport 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
						Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. There are measure to control the movement of HGVs on certain types of road that can be applied when deemed necessary.	
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	HGVs currently cannot pass near Emmanuel Church, Saunders Lane, without mounting the pavement.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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. There are measures that can be introduced to control the movement of HGVs on particular roads. This will apply if it is deemed necessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	HGVs currently cannot pass near Emmanuel Church, Saunders Lane, without mounting the pavement.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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. There are measures that can be introduced to control the movement of HGVs on particular roads. This will apply if it is deemed necessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	HGVs currently cannot pass near Emmanuel Church, Saunders Lane, without mounting the pavement.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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. There are measures that can be introduced to control the movement of HGVs on particular roads. This will apply if it is deemed necessary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, roads are narrow and mostly unlit.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, roads are narrow and mostly unlit.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section	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
						20 and 3.	of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, roads are narrow and mostly unlit.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, roads are narrow and mostly unlit.	None stated.	The proposed has planning permission. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	Mayford has poor public transport system with limited bus service.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision in addressed comprehensively in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	Mayford has poor public transport system with limited bus service.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision in addressed comprehensively in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Mayford has poor public transport system with limited bus service.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision in addressed comprehensively in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	Mayford has poor public transport system with limited bus service.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision in addressed comprehensively in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matter 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book. Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	The Council fully acknowledges the distinctive character of Mayford, and Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect this character. Based on the collective evidence set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the general character of Mayford as a result of the proposals.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book. Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	The Council fully acknowledges the distinctive character of Mayford, and Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect this character. Based on the collective evidence set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the general character of Mayford as a result of the proposals	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book. Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	The Council fully acknowledges the distinctive character of Mayford, and Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect this character. Based on the collective evidence set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the general character of Mayford as a result of the proposals	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday book. Green Belt land is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking Mayford and Guildford.	None stated.	The Council fully acknowledges the distinctive character of Mayford, and Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect this character. Based on the collective evidence set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the general character of Mayford as a result of the proposals	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances". This has not been proved by Woking Council, other than the land is owned by a developer.	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances". This has not been proved by Woking Council, other than the land is owned by a developer.	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances". This has not been proved by Woking Council, other than the land is owned by a developer.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Core Strategy has been established in the Core Strategy, in particular, Policy CS6. The safeguarding of site to meet development needs beyond 2027 has	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the strength of national planning policy behind it. In particular, paragraph 85 of the NPPF.	
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances". This has not been proved by Woking Council, other than the land is owned by a developer.	None stated.	The issue 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	Saunders Lane and Egley Road already flood periodically, more ground concreted will be less water absorption hence flooding can only get worse.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the proposals can be developed without risk of flooding to occupiers or exacerbate flooding elsewhere. The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Saunders Lane and Egley Road already flood periodically, more ground concreted will be less water absorption hence flooding can only get worse.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	Saunders Lane and Egley Road already flood periodically, more ground concreted will be less water absorption hence flooding can only get worse.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	Saunders Lane and Egley Road already flood periodically, more ground concreted will be less water absorption hence flooding can only get worse.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test and it is not envisaged that the proposals will lead to unacceptable flood risk.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	The running track and leisure centre would introduce another 5000 a week car journeys, noise and light pollution.	None stated.	The leisure centre already has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	The running track and leisure centre would introduce another 5000 a week car journeys, noise and light pollution.	None stated.	The leisure centre already has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	The running track and leisure centre would introduce another 5000 a week car journeys, noise and light pollution.	None stated.	The leisure centre already has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	The running track and leisure centre would introduce another 5000 a week car journeys, noise and light pollution.	None stated.	The leisure centre already has planning approval.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	The roads around Mayford, particularly Saunders Lane, are already congested. Often gridlocked during morning and evening rush hours. 500 more homes will adversely affect the roads.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	The roads around Mayford, particularly Saunders Lane, are already congested. Often gridlocked during morning and evening rush hours. 500 more homes will adversely affect the roads.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	The roads around Mayford, particularly Saunders Lane, are already congested. Often gridlocked during morning and evening rush hours. 500 more homes will adversely affect the roads.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	The roads around Mayford, particularly Saunders Lane, are already congested. Often gridlocked during morning and evening rush hours. 500 more homes will adversely affect the roads.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are generally addressed in detail 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	The proposed development is totally disproportionate to the existing 1000 dwellings in Mayford.	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Council has carried out a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper to make sure that the overall purpose and/or character of the area are not significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	The proposed development is totally disproportionate to the existing 1000 dwellings in Mayford.	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Council has carried out a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper to make sure that the overall purpose and/or character of the area are not significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	The proposed development is totally disproportionate to the existing 1000 dwellings in Mayford.	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Council has carried out a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper to make sure that the overall purpose and/or character of the area are not significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	The proposed development is totally disproportionate to the existing 1000 dwellings in Mayford.	None stated.	Because of the existing constraints of the area, the Council has to identify the most sustainable sites to meet the development needs of the area. Whilst the Council accepts that the allocations are focused on certain areas of the borough, the sites are the most sustainable when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Council has carried out a range of studies as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper to make sure that the overall purpose and/or character of the area are not 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane serve the area to be developed and could not handle additional traffic. The third serves Worplesdon rail, a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane serve the area to be developed and could not handle additional traffic. The third serves Worplesdon rail, a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane serve the area to be developed and could not handle additional traffic. The third serves Worplesdon rail, a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane serve the area to be developed and could not handle additional traffic. The third serves Worplesdon rail, a major increase in congestion.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The proposals also include site specific requirements to make sure that detail site specific impacts are fully assessed to determine any appropriate mitigation measures. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	This development will completely wipe out much of the existing wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	This development will completely wipe out much of the existing wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	This development will completely wipe out much of the existing wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the	No further modification is 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. 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.	
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	This development will completely wipe out much of the existing wildlife.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	This development is totally unsustainable within the village of Mayford, which would be lost forever.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The collective evidence as set out in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the sites. Based on the evidence as set out in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23, it is not envisaged the proposals will undermine the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	This development is totally unsustainable within the village of Mayford, which would be lost forever.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The collective evidence as set out in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the sites. Based on the evidence as set out in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23, it is not envisaged the proposals will undermine the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	This development is totally unsustainable within the village of Mayford, which would be lost forever.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The collective evidence as set out in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the sites. Based on the evidence as set out in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23, it is not envisaged the proposals will undermine the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	This development is totally unsustainable within the village of Mayford, which would be lost forever.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in Section 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The collective evidence as set out in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of the sites. Based on the evidence as set out in detail in Sections 7, 19 and 23, it is not envisaged the proposals will undermine the overall character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
155	Roy	Turner	GB11	To correct this infrastructure would take vast amounts of public money.	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car. In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2	
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	To correct this infrastructure would take vast amounts of public money.	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB9	To correct this infrastructure would take vast amounts of public money.	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB10	To correct this infrastructure would take vast amounts of public money.	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
155	Roy	Turner	GB8	Register our objection to GB8 Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road Mayford GU22 OPL. We can possibly understand the need for a new school and erosion of the Green Belt under special circumstances but not the same reasoning behind a leisure centre and running track!	None stated.	The proposed school at site GB8 and the associated leisure facilities has the benefit of planning approval. The Council is satisfied that it can be sustainably developed. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	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/SHLAWB019b 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	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
					Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. 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
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See 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
1088	Kim	Turner	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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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	
1088	Kim	Turner	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 for the reasons stated.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	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 for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test. There is no evidence to suggest that there will be health and safety issues for children playing near the Hoe Stream or children activities will result in more debris in the water.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1088	Kim	Turner	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible Green Belt boundary. Strong boundaries include motorways and railway lines. The changes would make for a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible Green Belt boundary. Strong boundaries include motorways and railway lines. The changes would make for a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	
1088	Kim	Turner	GB8	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The ownership of land has not influence the selection of land. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB10	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.</p> <p>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. 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. I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and</p>	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. It is not envisaged that the development will undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites as set in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive development.			
1088	Kim	Turner	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has carried out an assessment of the urban area to meet development needs. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	GB11	The football club and new pitch/s are to move to Salt Box Road, Guildford, with associated additional traffic. Slyfield	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with its neighbouring authorities to make sure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts on Woking. Regarding the	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Industrial Estate will be expanded with 1,000 new homes. This Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking / Mayford residents. Gridlock inevitable.		traffic implications of the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD the Council has carried out extensive Transport Assessment to inform the proposals. 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.	of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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.	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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.	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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.	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	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
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site 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
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside the landowner's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	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	No further modification is 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. 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.	
1088	Kim	Turner	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford due to proximity to a "Local Centre", however other than a Post Office and barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents living on 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. 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
1088	Kim	Turner	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1088	Kim	Turner	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
1088	Kim	Turner	GB7	Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density. The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAAWB019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. 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
1089	Myles	Turner	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				or contribute to existing character.	by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	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 for the reasons stated.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	<p>The site is adjacent to 22 houses, including heritage assets. Development should comply with CS14, CS24 and the PPFTS in that it should have not adverse impacts on the character of the local area or local environment.</p> <p>The site was granted planning permission in 1987 for one family only. Additional pitches will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and local environment and will have an adverse impact on the openness of the area which is contrary to CS6, CS14, CS24 and the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.</p> <p>Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test. There is no evidence to suggest that there will be health and safety issues for children playing near the Hoe Stream or children activities will result in more debris in the water.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.		<p>Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	
1089	Myles	Turner	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This issue is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.			
1089	Myles	Turner	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the allocation of sites. This particular matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive development.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. It is not envisaged that the development will undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites as set in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has	No further modification is 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. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.		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.	
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignore	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	
1089	Myles	Turner	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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.	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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.	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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.	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
1089	Myles	Turner	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	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
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The site is considered to contain contaminated land. It is therefore unsuitable to consider using the site for residential uses until the land has been properly remediated.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The SHLAA treats all sites in the Green Belt as currently not developable. Green Belt sites will only be released for development through the plan making process. Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site 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
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council is satisfied that the number of pitches on the site can be increased without undermining the general character of the area or the amenity of its occupiers.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				to be expanded outside the landowner's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1089	Myles	Turner	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	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. 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
1089	Myles	Turner	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Transport 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.	
1089	Myles	Turner	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1089	Myles	Turner	GB7	<p>Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and contrary to Policy CS6 and Section 9 of the NPPF.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1 and 4. Whilst Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the purpose of the Green Belt, it also commits the Council to release Green Belt land to meet development requirements of the Core Strategy. The proposal is therefore not contrary to Policy CS6 or the NPPF.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAAB019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation needs for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 4. Ten Acre Farm is about 3.36ha. 72.05% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 6.52% in Flood Zone 2 and 5.51% in Flood Zone 3. The Council has carried out a sequential tests to justify the use of the site to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. 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
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	Ten Acre Farm does not have the required accessibility, contrary to Woking Core Strategy and SHLAA. Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. Smarts Heath Road is not close to facilities, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure, poor public transport, and provision of a communal building would not positively enhance the environment, increase openness or contribute to existing character.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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. It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will help meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. The comment about the poor level of public transport services in the area is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	The site has little or no infrastructure or services on site at present and will require a substantial investment to connect the site to essential services. Acoustic barriers will also be required to mitigate the noise pollution from the railway line. The costs of preparing the site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is an existing well established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied that the use can sustainably be intensified to accommodate further additional pitches. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The key requirements of the allocation will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	The site offers no visual privacy and the noise pollution from the railway line is unlikely to be suitably mitigated. The road to the site is busy with lorries and with no footpath, this would result in health and safety concerns.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	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 for the reasons stated.	The Council has a clear objective to protect environmentally sensitive sites, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	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 for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	The proposed business use of the site would not comply with Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008. Business use on the site would result in noise, traffic and nuisance to residents which is also out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. In doing so, the Council need to make sure that the allocation should reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability. The bullet point will be reworded to clarify this point. The overall justification for the allocation of the site for Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	Pitches at the site would have a health and safety risk for children playing close to the Hoe Stream. It will also result in more debris in the water and could result in uncontrolled flooding.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test. There is no evidence to suggest that there will be health and safety issues for children playing near the Hoe Stream or children activities will result in more debris in the water.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if the development of the school will result in housing on the fields either side of the school later on.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed	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	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
				changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The Green Belt Review states a school on Egley Road would maintain openness; misleading if the school is a precursor to housing on fields either side later on.		that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. The Council is satisfied that the proposed Green Belt boundary will be defensible and have permanent endurance beyond the Plan period. The site can also be developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment. The Council has been transparent to allocate site GB8 for a school and residential. Both uses can be developed without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt.	of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This issue is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the allocation of sites. This particular matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	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.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>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.</p> <p>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 states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not. I strongly object to development of GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11. Any housing will fill the open green space between Mayford and Woking, altering the character of the village and impacting residents. Mayford has strong historical importance and was listed in the Domesday Book. The GBBR incorrectly dismisses this, saying Woking is not considered to have particularly strong historical character. The Council should preserve and promote the history of the Borough not destroy it through excessive development.</p>		<p>towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. It is not envisaged that the development will undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out an assessment of brownfield sites as set in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	
1123	Paul	Turner	GB11	<p>National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by Woking Borough Council, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment. The GBBR incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt purpose 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Mayford has a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.</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
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	<p>All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.</p>	<p>The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons</p>	<p>This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					stated.		
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1123	Paul	Turner	GB10	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB11	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB8	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB9	There are significant development proposals in Guildford. The Guildford DPD has not been disclosed to Woking or Mayford residents. These developments will also increase traffic in the local area and the network will be gridlocked.	None stated.	Under the Duty to Cooperate, Guildford and Woking Borough Council's will have to work positively and cooperatively together to address any issues of cross boundary significance. The Council will ensure that development proposals in Guildford does not have significant adverse impacts in Woking that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes ""Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance"" and therefore should not be considered for development. Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Green Belt boundary review does not ignore the importance of landscape as a consideration in the site selection process. Indeed, the Council has applied the appropriate approach for assessing the landscape implications for developing the sites. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7. The Green Belt boundary review also provides evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations north of Saunders Lane can be released from the Green Belt and developed without undermining the integrity of the escarpment.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				allowed within 400m.		Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.	
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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.	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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.	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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.	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	GB8	Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a sequential test to inform the selection of sites and is satisfied that the proposals will not lead to unacceptable flood risk to occupants or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	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
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	No independently verified evidence demonstrating Woking Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development or why sites listed in the Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included whilst others excluded. Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres are the ONLY proposed sites.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	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 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	A sequential approach must be taken to identify suitable sites for allocation, with urban area sites considered before those in the Green Belt.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development needs of the area. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Sufficient sites could not be identified in the urban area to meet development needs over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development needs is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1123	Paul	Turner	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. 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
1123	Paul	Turner	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday needs of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily needs of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure needs to support the allocated sites is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1123	Paul	Turner	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	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	
1266	Michael, Joan	Turner	GB5	Object to proposals. There is insufficient infrastructure to support an increase of residents.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1266	Michael, Joan	Turner	GB6	Object to proposals. There is insufficient infrastructure to support an increase of residents.	None stated.	The representation regarding infrastructure and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB8	Because of the village's location and conservation it cannot accommodate increases in pavements, roads, lighting and other infrastructure that would be required.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that 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
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB9	Because of the village's location and conservation it cannot accommodate increases in pavements, roads, lighting and other infrastructure that would be required.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB10	Because of the village's location and conservation it cannot accommodate increases in pavements, roads, lighting and other infrastructure that would be required.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that 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
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB11	Because of the village's location and conservation it cannot accommodate increases in pavements, roads, lighting and other infrastructure that would be required.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto Saunders Lane. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB14	Because of the village's location and conservation it cannot accommodate increases in pavements, roads, lighting and other infrastructure that would be required.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, 20.0 and 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB7	Object to increasing the number of pitches on the site. Mayford's contribution to the Traveller community is already sufficient.	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
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB8	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB9	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB10	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB11	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB14	Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB7	Previous planning application have been refused because of the environmental impact on the Green Belt. Support the continued preservation of the Green Belt.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB8	Will impact the wildlife, greenery and atmosphere of the area and surrounding areas. No consideration given to preserving the noise, traffic, air quality or village life.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The Council accepts that 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 site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on noise and air quality without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures. A Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment could be required.</p> <p>The representation regarding traffic has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB9	Will impact the wildlife, greenery and atmosphere of the area and surrounding areas. No consideration given to preserving the noise, traffic, air quality or village life.	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
						<p>approval of the development.</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 site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on noise and air quality without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures. A Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment could be required.</p> <p>The representation regarding traffic has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p>	
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB10	Will impact the wildlife, greenery and atmosphere of the area and surrounding areas. No consideration given to preserving the noise, traffic, air quality or village life.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The Council accepts that 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 site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on noise and air quality without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures. A Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment could be required.</p>	No further modification is proposed 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 representation regarding traffic has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p>	
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB11	Will impact the wildlife, greenery and atmosphere of the area and surrounding areas. No consideration given to preserving the noise, traffic, air quality or village life.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>The Council accepts that 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 site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. This is noted within the key requirements for the site which note that the provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities are required to make sure the site is integrated into the local context.</p> <p>In addition, the Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policy wording to prevent development proposals that will have a significant negative impact on noise and air quality without identifying and implementing suitable mitigation measures. A Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment could be required.</p> <p>The representation regarding traffic has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed the parcels of Green Belt land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. None of the proposed allocations will lead to unacceptable urban sprawl.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB14	Will impact the wildlife, greenery and atmosphere of the area and surrounding areas. No consideration given to preserving the noise, traffic, air quality or village life.	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that this site is proposed to be allocated for green infrastructure and not development. Allocation of this site is likely to have a positive impact on biodiversity, pollution and open space provision.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB14	Object to housing development on the site. Moved to Mayford because of the Green Belt and the clear division from the urban centre and rural leisure provisions. This gives an immediate environment change, including traffic, noise and air quality.	None stated.	<p>It should be noted that this site is proposed to be allocated for green infrastructure and not development. Allocation of this site is likely to have a positive impact on biodiversity, pollution and open space provision.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB8	Object to housing development on the site. Moved to Mayford because of the Green Belt and the clear division from the urban centre and rural leisure provisions. This gives an immediate environment change, including traffic, noise	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is 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 air quality.			
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB9	Object to housing development on the site. Moved to Mayford because of the Green Belt and the clear division from the urban centre and rural leisure provisions. This gives an immediate environment change, including traffic, noise and air quality.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB10	Object to housing development on the site. Moved to Mayford because of the Green Belt and the clear division from the urban centre and rural leisure provisions. This gives an immediate environment change, including traffic, noise and air quality.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
1003	Jason Victoria	Turner Straughan	GB11	Object to housing development on the site. Moved to Mayford because of the Green Belt and the clear division from the urban centre and rural leisure provisions. This gives an immediate environment change, including traffic, noise and air quality.	None stated.	This representation has been 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
905	Stephen	Twilley	General	Infrastructure improvements must be in place prior to development starting. It isn't fair residents contribute to Council fun and development cause an additional burden on infrastructure whilst developers profit from the project. There have been several major developments along Pyrford Road which have contributed to exponential traffic growth, but no road improvements have been made.	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
905	Stephen	Twilley	General	WBC's stated commitment to protect the integrity of the Green Belt is commended provided action follows. Questions why 4,964 dwellings are required. Questions where people who have a need for affordable housing are living currently.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.2 to 1.9	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
905	Stephen	Twilley	GB16	There should be no further major developments in the area unless major road improvements to the road network in and out of West Byfleet. This road has not been mentioned in the Core Strategy but is one of the most heavily used 3 digit road in the country and connects WTC to the A3, Weybridge and M25. Development will increase traffic and cause more congestion which is unfair on residents.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
905	Stephen	Twilley	GB15	There should be no further major developments in the area unless major road improvements to the road network in and out of West Byfleet. This road has not been mentioned in the Core Strategy but is one of the most heavily used 3 digit road	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				in the country and connects WTC to the A3, Weybridge and M25. Development will increase traffic and cause more congestion which is unfair on residents.		<p>These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
424	Michael	Ure	General	GB must be preserved, once you start chipping away at it there will be no stopping. Additional housing will strain resources	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
424	Michael	Ure	General	Additional housing will cause major disruption on an already busy area	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
424	Michael	Ure	GB4	The Byfleet petition 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
424	Michael	Ure	GB5	The Byfleet petition has been ignored	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Representor ID 1524.	
424	Michael	Ure	GB4	Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding and any additional housing will exacerbate problems.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
424	Michael	Ure	GB5	Byfleet is historically susceptible to flooding and any additional housing will exacerbate problems.	None stated.	The Council attaches great importance to Flood Risk and this is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 5.0. The Council is aware of the flood incidents in the Byfleet area and can advise that the Environment Agency are working with relevant partners to develop future Flood Alleviation Schemes along the River Wey (including around Byfleet) in order to reduce flood risk to Local communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
426	Anne	Ure	GB4	The roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic. They are often gridlocked at present	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
426	Anne	Ure	GB5	The roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic. They are often gridlocked at present	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent roads. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
426	Anne	Ure	GB4	Flooding is a major concern and will be more so in light of the proposals	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
426	Anne	Ure	GB5	Flooding is a major concern and will be more so in light of the proposals	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
426	Anne	Ure	GB4	Has the Byfleet petition 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
426	Anne	Ure	GB5	Has the Byfleet petition 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
426	Anne	Ure	GB4	The small amount of GB left should be preserved. More housing will take away the few outside spaces left.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
426	Anne	Ure	GB5	The small amount of GB left should be preserved. More housing will take away the few outside spaces left.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha). Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
426	Anne	Ure	GB4	There has already been plenty of new housing built in Byfleet (mainly over 55 accommodation).	None stated.	Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9. The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in 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>It should also be noted the housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock.</p>	
426	Anne	Ure	GB5	There has already been plenty of new housing built in Byfleet (mainly over 55 accommodation).	None stated.	<p>Whilst this representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development needs up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>It should also be noted the housing need has been calculated taking into account the current housing stock.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
426	Anne	Ure	GB4	Health Centre in West Byfleet is at capacity. The proposals don't have suitable service infrastructure to support it.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
426	Anne	Ure	GB5	Health Centre in West Byfleet is at capacity. The proposals don't have suitable service infrastructure to support it.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
609	T	Usher	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the areas and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	
609	T	Usher	GB7	Objects to the proposal. 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
609	T	Usher	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 and Hook Heath as separate settlements to Woking, 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
609	T	Usher	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 and Hook Heath as separate settlements to Woking, 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
609	T	Usher	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 and Hook Heath as separate settlements to Woking, 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
609	T	Usher	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 and Hook Heath as separate settlements to Woking, 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
609	T	Usher	GB14	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 and Hook Heath as separate settlements to Woking, 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
609	T	Usher	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
609	T	Usher	GB8	The land is used as agriculture and leisure areas for villagers.	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 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>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
609	T	Usher	GB9	The land is used as agriculture and leisure areas for villagers.	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 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>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
609	T	Usher	GB10	The land is used as agriculture and leisure areas for villagers.	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 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>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
609	T	Usher	GB11	The land is used as agriculture and leisure areas for villagers.	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 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest. 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.	
609	T	Usher	GB14	The land is used as agriculture and leisure areas for villagers.	None stated.	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. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
609	T	Usher	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact of an increased population on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain on transport infrastructure. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some 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
609	T	Usher	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact of an increased population on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain on transport infrastructure. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some 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
609	T	Usher	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact of an increased population on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain on transport infrastructure. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some 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
609	T	Usher	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact of an increased population on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain on transport infrastructure. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some 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
609	T	Usher	GB14	There has been no consideration of the impact of an increased population on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain on transport infrastructure. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some 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
1162	Paul	Uttley	DNSITE	We understand the main issue is that the site lies within a flood plain and is in Flood Zone 2. Our clients have resided in the property for over thirty years and the land has never	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals in addressed in detail in Section 5 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The DPD is informed a range of studies including the Sustainability Appraisal Report. The collective evidence does not support the allocation 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
				flooded. Flood Zone 2 does not rule out general residential uses, only highly vulnerable uses and even then exceptions are possible. Development on the site could be designed to mitigate against flooding, as demonstrated by Summer Close (to which the Environment Agency raised no objections subject to mitigation).			
1162	Paul	Uttley	DNSITE	We have provided a document setting out how the site can be developed and its general constraints and opportunities. In summary it will yield up to 20 family residential units; a mix of units ; in easy walking distance of Byfleet village centre, other closer shops and services; there is significant local employment opportunity; the site would provide affordable housing in line with Policy CS12 ; the dwellings can be built to 'Lifetime Homes' Standards; there is no history of contamination; any development could incorporate Su; the site is self-contained and can be developed whilst preserving and enhancing the surrounding landscape; the development could achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Code 5.	None stated.	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. The site is within parcel 7 of the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1162	Paul	Uttley	DNSITE	Manor Farm forms part of land to the East of Byfleet (SHLAABY078) originally considered for removal from the Green Belt. Our client site only represents a small part of the overall land. Recognising 130 dwellings on the whole original site would have significant impacts, o our representation relates only to a one acre site to the north, adjacent to the settlement boundary/urban area. Whilst we understand the Council's comments and concerns regarding the overall development, this site should be considered on its own individual merits and assessed separately from the overall package.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of alternative sites to determine which sites should be allocated to meet the development needs of the area. Based on the evidence, the Council does not think that this site should be allocated for development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1162	Paul	Uttley	DNSITE	Manor Farm, Mill Lane, Byfleet, Woking, Surrey KT14 7RT was submitted for consideration as an allocated site on the 20th May 2015. It is not one of the proposed allocated sites but should be considered for inclusion and would benefit the Borough in meeting its housing land supply in a sustainable manner.	None stated.	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. The site is within parcel 7 of the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1162	Paul	Uttley	DNSITE	Although Byfleet has a large and thriving community, most of the housing allocations are to the west, particularly short term allocations. Allocation of the proposed, immediately available site would provide housing spread development across the Borough, reducing the need to travel and promoting more sustainable patterns of land use development.	None stated.	The Council has assessed reasonable alternative sites. Measured against other reasonable alternatives, the Council does not think that sites to the east of Byfleet should be allocated for residential development. The site is within parcel 7 of the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1162	Paul	Uttley	DNSITE	Please see attached letter and document relating to Manor Farm, Mill Lane Byfleet, Woking, Surrey. CHECK ORIGINAL / DELETE	None stated.	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. The site is within parcel 7 of the Green Belt boundary review report.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB15	Object to the proposals. The volume of traffic will prevent emergency vehicle access and pollution levels will exceed EU guidelines. Station Approach and the entrance to Waitrose is already congested and difficult to negotiate.	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	No further modification is proposed 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 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. In addition the Development Management Policies DPD contains a robust policy regarding air pollution and mitigation requirements to minimise the impact of development.</p> <p>The area of Station Approach noted within the representation should be addressed by the comprehensive redevelopment of site UA51 which is included within the site boundary.</p>	
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB16	Object to the proposals. The volume of traffic will prevent emergency vehicle access and pollution levels will exceed EU guidelines. Station Approach and the entrance to Waitrose is already congested and difficult to negotiate.	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 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. In addition the Development Management Policies DPD contains a robust policy regarding air pollution and mitigation requirements to minimise the impact of development.</p> <p>The area of Station Approach noted within the representation should be addressed by the comprehensive redevelopment of site UA51 which is included within the site boundary.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB12	Object to development in West Byfleet and Pyrford due to the negative impact on West Byfleet. Traffic volumes will increase and will both impede emergency vehicles as well as generate air pollution levels above European guidelines. The area around the Station and Waitrose is already congested.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <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. In addition the Development Management Policies DPD contains a robust policy regarding air pollution and mitigation requirements to minimise the impact of development.</p> <p>The area of Station Approach noted within the representation should be addressed by the comprehensive redevelopment of site UA51 which is included within the site boundary.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB13	Object to development in West Byfleet and Pyrford due to the negative impact on West Byfleet. Traffic volumes will increase and will both impede emergency vehicles as well as generate air pollution levels above European guidelines. The area around the Station and Waitrose is already congested.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The 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. In addition the Development Management Policies DPD contains a robust policy regarding air pollution and mitigation requirements to minimise the impact of development.</p> <p>The area of Station Approach noted within the representation should be addressed by the comprehensive redevelopment of site UA51 which is included within the site boundary.</p>	
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB15	Little thought has been given to the impact on health services, schools and infrastructure with this overdevelopment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>Regarding the representation on health care 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB16	Little thought has been given to the impact on health services, schools and infrastructure with this overdevelopment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>Regarding the representation on health care 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB12	Little thought has been given to the impact on health services, schools and infrastructure with this overdevelopment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>Regarding the representation on health care 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1551	J.B.	Vache	GB13	Little thought has been given to the impact on health services, schools and infrastructure with this overdevelopment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>Regarding the representation on health care 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
429	Edward	Valletta	UA28	If the proposals go ahead, then due consideration should be given to provision relevant supporting infrastructure	None stated.	<p>With regards to the representation on pollution, the Core Strategy e.g. Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy, Daylight SPD and emerging policies in the Development Management Policies DPD, include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development proposals avoid any significant harm to the environment including significant harm to air and water quality or harm resulting from light and noise pollution.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
429	Edward	Valletta	UA28	Concerned about more housing on Barnsbury Estate. The area is already densely populated and additional housing will put more pressure on local infrastructure, including road, services and facilities	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 18.0, 23.0 and 3.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
121	Michael	Valter	GB12	Green Belt should prevent urban sprawl	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that this purpose of the Green Belt will be undermined by the proposals of the DPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
121	Michael	Valter	GB13	Green Belt should prevent urban sprawl	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
121	Michael	Valter	GB12	Pyrford has a number of historic buildings and conservation areas. Development within the Green Belt would have an adverse impact on these heritage assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the development will cause Pyrford to merge with any other town/village.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
121	Michael	Valter	GB13	Pyrford has a number of historic buildings and conservation areas. Development within the Green Belt would have an adverse impact on these heritage assets.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development needs of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development needs over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	GB15	Development will have a negative impact on existing and planning infrastructure, including school places, health care provision and water supply	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively 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>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 the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	GB16	Broadoaks, if developed sensitively, could be a major asset for West Byfleet and meet some of our housing needs.	None stated.	This is noted. The site is being allocated for mixed use to include residential use.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The sites have been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal SA. The SA assessed all potential sites against various indicators. The SA Framework used for the appraisal of the alternative options is objective-led and has provided a consistent basis for describing, analysing and comparing the sustainability effects of the various options and the specific proposals of the Site Allocations DPD. The SA Report is on the Council's website. It includes all the reasonable alternative sites that were appraised (see Appendix 5 of the SA Report of the draft Site Allocations DPD) and why sites have either been selected or rejected (see Tables 7 and 8 of the SA Report).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Many of these issues have also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	GB15	Fails to see how the preservation of character and landscape character is being achieved through developing the site	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 landscape character and assessments has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into account at the Development Management stage.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	GB15	Object to the proposed use of the Green Belt land for housing and commercial uses as use of the site fails to meet the five national purposes of the Green Belt.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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 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 landscape edge and minimise the impact of development on the character and landscape 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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</p>	No further modification is proposed 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 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>	
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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, in particular paragraph 3.9 and 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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 landscape 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> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1040	Kees	van den Aarssen	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
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	Development will have a negative impact on existing and planning infrastructure, including school places, health care provision and water supply	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively 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. 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. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	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.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. As part of the future review of the IDP, the Council will work with utility service providers to make sure that supply keeps up with demand.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB16	Broadoaks, if developed sensitively, could be a major asset for West Byfleet and meet some of our housing needs.	None stated.	This is noted. The site is being allocated for mixed use to include residential use.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The sites have been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal SA. The SA assessed all potential sites against various indicators. The SA Framework used for the appraisal of the alternative options is objective-led and has provided a consistent basis for describing, analysing and comparing the sustainability effects of the various options and the specific proposals of the Site Allocations DPD. The SA Report is on the Council's website. It includes all the reasonable alternative sites that were appraised (see Appendix 5 of the SA Report of the draft Site Allocations DPD) and why sites have either been selected or rejected (see Tables 7 and 8 of the SA Report). Many of these issues have also been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	Fails to see how the preservation of character and landscape character is being achieved through developing the site	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. The representation regarding landscape character and assessments has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. In landscape terms, most of the allocations have the capacity to accommodate change. This is set out within the Green Belt Boundary Review. Development can be achieved on this site without undermining the landscape character of the area. Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 will be taken into	No further modification is 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 at the Development Management stage.	
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	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 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 landscape edge and minimise the impact of development on the character and landscape 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	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
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	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, in particular paragraph 3.9 and 3.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	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 landscape 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> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The heath centre is at capacity and above the recommended threshold.	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
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	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
1047	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The IDP states that there will be a shortage of school places in Byfleet and West Byfleet by 2019.	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
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The Green Belt acts as a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. It also reduces the noise of the M25.	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. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to control noise and pollution as a result of the proposals. The</p>	No further modification is 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 believes that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Byfleet and West Byfleet as separate communities.	
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	I fail to see how the Council's additional context - regarding preservation of the character and quality of the setting of the Borough and assessment of the landscape character - is being achieved by the proposed use of West Hall.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land 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. West Hall can be developed without undermining the landscape character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	Main concern is about the impact on the volume of traffic on Parvis Road. The existing traffic is already at a standstill, partly due to the development of Brooklands. Congestion will have a negative impact on emergency services. The WBC Transport Evaluation 2010 does not take into account development in this part of the borough and therefore is not relevant to the assessment of the release of Green Belt land around West Hall.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of the proposals in the DPD. The SA has concluded that overall the proposals will promote sustainable development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB16	It is necessary to view the future use of West Hall land in the context of the 44 acre Broadoaks site. If sensitively developed, Broadoaks could become a major asset to the community and meet some housing needs. Development of this site will exacerbate existing traffic, increase pressure on schools, health care, public transport, water supply and sewerage services. I would be interested in your comments on my view of Green Belt areas and the actions you will take to ensure responsible future development of a sustainable and "joined-up" plan.	None stated.	Broadoaks is already designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. Because the site has not come forward for development since this designation, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to expend the uses on the site to include residential development and elderly people's accommodation. The Council will make sure through the application of the key requirements of the proposal that the site is sensitively developed. In addition to Broadoaks, West Hall will also be needed to contribute to meeting the development needs of the area, and its allocation is justified by the Council's available evidence. The impacts of both proposals, in particular, the traffic impacts are assessed. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land including West Hall for development is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. To inform the allocations, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the general character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is also working its neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the impacts of development in their area such as Wisley Airfield that has cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	There is very little natural green space in West Byfleet. The Wey Navigation has historic importance and enjoyed for recreational uses.. Development will have a negative impact on Wey Navigation which is an important wildlife corridor. The Wey Navigation is used for recreational purposes and should be protected. If this plan was to go ahead we could have no Green Belt area within our village.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the ecological integrity of the Wey Navigation. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors	No further modification is 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 green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	Attach a copy of the letter provided by the WBNF, which reflects my concerns about the proposed developments. I am very strongly opposed to use of Green Belt at West Hall. Fail to see how this would meet national planning policy stated Green Belt purposes.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land 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
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of the proposals in the DPD. The SA has concluded that overall the proposals will promote sustainable development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1082	Thomas	van den Aarssen	GB15	The land also floods and will need to be considered.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	The Green Belt acts as a natural buffer between Byfleet and West Byfleet. It also reduces the noise of the M25.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to control noise and pollution as a result of the proposals. The Council believes that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Byfleet and West Byfleet as separate communities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	I fail to see how the Council's additional context - regarding preservation of the character and quality of the setting of the Borough and assessment of the landscape character - is being achieved by the proposed use of West Hall.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land 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. West Hall can be developed without undermining the landscape character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	Main concern is about the impact on the volume of traffic on Parvis Road. The existing traffic is already at a standstill, partly due to the development of Brooklands. Congestion will have a negative impact on emergency services. The WBC Transport Evaluation 2010 does not take into account development in this part of the borough and therefore is not relevant to the assessment of the release of Green Belt land around West Hall.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development needs is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of the proposals in the DPD. The SA has concluded that overall the proposals will promote sustainable development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB16	It is necessary to view the future use of West Hall land in the context of the 44 acre Broadoaks site. If sensitively developed, Broadoaks could become a major asset to the community and meet some housing needs. Development of this site will exacerbate existing traffic, increase pressure on schools, health care, public transport, water supply and sewerage services. I would be interested in your comments on my view of Green	None stated.	Broadoaks is already designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt for high quality office development. Because the site has not come forward for development since this designation, the Site Allocations DPD seeks to expend the uses on the site to include residential development and elderly people's accommodation. The Council will make sure through the application of the key requirements of the proposal that the site is sensitively developed. In addition to Broadoaks, West Hall will also be needed to contribute to meeting the development needs of the area, and its allocation is justified by the Council's available evidence. The impacts of both proposals, in particular, the traffic impacts are assessed. The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of	No further modification is 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 areas and the actions you will take to ensure responsible future development of a sustainable and "joined-up" plan.		Green Belt land including West Hall for development is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. To inform the allocations, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the general character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is also working its neighbouring authorities such as Guildford to make sure that the impacts of development in their area such as Wisley Airfield that has cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address any adverse impacts.	
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	There is very little natural green space in West Byfleet. The Wey Navigation has historic importance and enjoyed for recreational uses.. Development will have a negative impact on Wey Navigation which is an important wildlife corridor. The Wey Navigation is used for recreational purposes and should be protected. If this plan was to go ahead we could have no Green Belt area within our village.	None stated.	It is not envisaged that the proposals will compromise the ecological integrity of the Wey Navigation. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	Attach a copy of the letter provided by the WBNF, which reflects my concerns about the proposed developments. I am very strongly opposed to use of Green Belt at West Hall. Fail to see how this would meet national planning policy stated Green Belt purposes.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land 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
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	The principles of sustainable development are not being met by the proposed development, as listed.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a sustainability appraisal of the proposals in the DPD. The SA has concluded that overall the proposals will promote sustainable development in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1085	Daniel	van den Aarssen	GB15	The land also floods and will need to be considered.	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	General	Develop brown fields instead of Green Belts.	Develop brown fields instead of green belts.	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
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB8	Development of housing estates, a retail park and school would create further traffic on Egley Road	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority and County Highways Authority as the site has been granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p>	
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB9	Development of housing estates, a retail park and school would create further traffic on Egley Road	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority and County Highways Authority as the site has been granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB10	Development of housing estates, a retail park and school would create further traffic on Egley Road	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority and County Highways Authority as the site has been granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						It should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.	
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB11	Development of housing estates, a retail park and school would create further traffic on Egley Road	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority and County Highways Authority as the site has been granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB14	Development of housing estates, a retail park and school would create further traffic on Egley Road	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p> <p>The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority and County Highways Authority as the site has been granted planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council has no intention of allocating sites for a retail park in Mayford. As noted in proposed allocation GB9, there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day needs of local people and will not have a significant impact on the highways network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB8	Green Belt has been implemented for a reason - to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. This is more relevant today than ever, with increasing traffic and pollution. Green Belt separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding urban sprawl and maintaining the separation between towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. and 15.0.</p> <p>It is noted that traffic and pollution are concerns for local people. The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document 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>available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on noise or air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Council is also working with Surrey County Highways Authority to determine the impact of the proposed allocations on the road network and what mitigation measures will be required to make sure that the existing situation is not exacerbated. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6.</p>	
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB9	Green Belt has been implemented for a reason - to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. This is more relevant today then ever, with increasing traffic and pollution. Green Belt separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding urban sprawl and maintaining the separation between towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. and 15.0.</p> <p>It is noted that traffic and pollution are concerns for local people. The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on noise or air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Council is also working with Surrey County Highways Authority to determine the impact of the proposed allocations on the road network and what mitigation measures will be required to make sure that the existing situation is not exacerbated. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB10	Green Belt has been implemented for a reason - to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. This is more relevant today then ever, with increasing traffic and pollution. Green Belt separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding urban sprawl and maintaining the separation between towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. and 15.0.</p> <p>It is noted that traffic and pollution are concerns for local people. The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on noise or air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Council is also working with Surrey County Highways Authority to determine the impact of the proposed allocations on the road network and what mitigation measures will be required to make sure that the existing situation is not exacerbated. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB11	Green Belt has been implemented for a reason - to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. This is more relevant today then ever, with increasing traffic and pollution. Green Belt separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding urban sprawl and maintaining the separation between towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. and 15.0.</p> <p>It is noted that traffic and pollution are concerns for local people. The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on noise or air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Council is also working with Surrey County Highways Authority to determine the impact of the proposed allocations on the road network and what mitigation measures will be required to make sure that the existing situation is not exacerbated. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB14	Green Belt has been implemented for a reason - to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns and villages. This is more relevant today than ever, with increasing traffic and pollution. Green Belt separates Hook Heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the representation regarding urban sprawl and maintaining the separation between towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. and 15.0.</p> <p>It is noted that traffic and pollution are concerns for local people. The potential increase in pollution has been considered with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. This document is available for viewing online on the Council's website. Generally, the sites identified for allocation are not expected to have a significant impact on noise or air pollution as the sites are in close proximity to the existing urban areas, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Council is also working with Surrey County Highways Authority to determine the impact of the proposed allocations on the road network and what mitigation measures will be required to make sure that the existing situation is not exacerbated. More information can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB8	The Council has not justified a case for exception circumstances to allow the release of Green Belt land - especially for the Safeguarded sites.	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
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB9	The Council has not justified a case for exception circumstances to allow the release of Green Belt land - especially for the Safeguarded sites.	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
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB10	The Council has not justified a case for exception circumstances to allow the release of Green Belt land - especially for the Safeguarded sites.	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
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB11	The Council has not justified a case for exception circumstances to allow the release of Green Belt land - especially for the Safeguarded sites.	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
663	Jan Jelle	Van der Meer	GB14	The Council has not justified a case for exception circumstances to allow the release of Green Belt land - especially for the Safeguarded sites.	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
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	The Green Belt provides a natural noise and amenity buffer between the Motorway and houses along Parvis Road	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt serves five purposes as set out in the NPPF. The main aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl. As a consequence this may create open areas which act as a noise buffer, however sites were not assessed for its ability to achieve this as it is not a primary Green Belt function.</p> <p>Nevertheless, proposals will be required to meet all other Development Plan policies. Including Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, emerging Development Management Policies, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD. These include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites avoid significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution.</p> <p>With respect to concerns about flooding, 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
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	Requests joined up, responsible thinking in terms of development in GB15 and GB16	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB16	Requests joined up, responsible thinking in terms of development in GB15 and GB16	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0 and Section 8.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	Concerned that if GB15 comes forward for development that there would be no GB left in West Byfleet	None stated.	The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose	No further modification is 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 integrity.	
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	<p>WBC have required the “preservation of the character and quality of the setting of the Borough” and that “an assessment of the landscape character and sensitivity to change of developing the various parcels of land was undertaken to ensure that the landscape character of area and the setting of the Borough are not compromised.” The proposed use will conflict with this.</p>	None stated.	<p>The need to remove Green Belt land to meet housing need has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0</p> <p>With respect to concerns regarding impact on the landscape and townscape character this has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0 and Section 23.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	<p>Concern about the increase of traffic along Parvis Road as a result of the proposal.</p> <p>Parvis road is already heavily used and is often congested due to its location between the A3 and M25.</p> <p>The position of the site means the entrance and egress is likely to be along Parvis Road. This coupled with the continued development of Brooklands (Elmbridge BC) and redevelopment of Broadoaks site (GB16) will make Parvis Road unpassable. Which would subsequently block access to the emergency services.</p> <p>The Transport Evaluation conducted in 2010 does not take into account proposal for GB15 and therefore can not prove there would be no impact on the road infrastructure. The report only considers scenarios around Worplesdon Station and Sutton Green.</p>	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
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB16	<p>Concern about the increase of traffic along Parvis Road as a result of the proposal.</p> <p>Parvis road is already heavily used and is often congested due to its location between the A3 and M25.</p> <p>The position of the site means the entrance and egress is likely to be along Parvis Road. This coupled with the continued development of Brooklands (Elmbridge BC) and redevelopment of Broadoaks site (GB16) will make Parvis Road unpassable. Which would subsequently block access to the emergency services.</p> <p>The Transport Evaluation conducted in 2010 does not take into account proposal for GB15 and therefore can not prove there would be no impact on the road infrastructure. The report only considers scenarios around Worplesdon Station and Sutton Green.</p>	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	Proposals will place additional strain on the existing infrastructure including schools, healthcare and the provision of utilities . Attention is drawn to WBC IDP which indicates that in West Byfleet has shortages in school places; health care at capacity; is an area of severe water supply stress and contains extensive areas at flood risk.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Schools: Section 3.0 paragraph 3.8 Flooding: Section 5.0 Water utilities: paragraph 3.9 The IDP notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. See also the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	The development of GB15 should be considered in context. It is adjacent Broadoaks (GB16), which itself could be an asset West Byfleet if redeveloped in a sensitive manner. However the both proposals will have significant impact on the local highways and infrastructure.	None stated.	The Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB16	The development of GB15 should be considered in context. It is adjacent Broadoaks (GB16), which itself could be an asset West Byfleet if redeveloped in a sensitive manner. However the both proposals will have significant impact on the local highways, infrastructure and utilities.	None stated.	The Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	The Wey Navigation is of historic value and an important form of public open space, enjoyed by walkers, runners and cyclists. It is also an important wildlife corridor. Development proposal for GB15 will have a significant impact on the Wey Navigation.	None stated.	<p>The value of the Wey Navigation as an important green corridor is acknowledged. The proposal text emphasises this and requires a buffer along the corridor to protect its distinctive character and wildlife value.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7.0, 23.0 and 21.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	The proposals for West Hall, West Byfleet conflicts with national GB policy. National policy sets out the various functions of the GB.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 10.0 and Section 1.0</p> <p>The response to the West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum (WBNF) can be found under Representor ID 1408.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	For development to be sustainable it should meet the criteria set. It is not considered that GB15 addresses all of these issues and can not be considered sustainable development	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p> <p>See Section 5.0 and paragraph 4.10-Flooding; See Section paragraph 1.6, Section 11.0, Section 16.0, and Section 18.0-efficient use of land and buildings; See paragraph 7.4-7.5, Section 23.0, paragraph 4.10, paragraph 3.1 and paragraph 3.7 - landscapes, habitats, flora and fauna; See paragraph 4.10- pollution levels: air, water, light, noise; See paragraph 1.13, Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.2, 3.3, 8.1, Section 20- transport See Section 7.0, particularly paragraph 7.5, Section 19.0- Heritage See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.1, 3.2, and 3.7- open space and recreation; See Section 3.0-infrastructure;</p> <p>There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The Council is satisfied that the proposals do promote economic growth. Proposals include commercial development and mixed use proposals in the Town Centre and sites are situated close to services and facilities. New residential development would also introduce more consumers to the local centres.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	The Dodd's Lane track is an important beauty spot, frequented by cyclists, dog walkers, runners etc. It should be protected	None stated.	<p>The proposed allocation of GB15 (Land surrounding West Hall) does not alter the existing Dodd's Lane track. As noted under the key requirements for the site, development design should additionally have regard to the existing footpath network. The pedestrian access from Dodd's Lane to the Wey Navigation should therefore be unaffected by the proposal and will continue to serve as a public right of way.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	The IDP does not assess the potential flood risk associated with the development of GB15 in enough depth. Given its proximity to the Wey Navigation, material consideration should be given to flooding and surface water management	None stated.	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
360	Annette	Van Essen	GB15	The area is subject to seasonal flooding and therefore plays a part in flood management.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 5.0. Nevertheless this site will require a Flood Risk Assessment as a key requirement, this is already set out in the proposal text	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1699	Cathy and Graham	Vann	GB12	The existing road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Access to the site will be dangerous due to the narrow roads.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1699	Cathy and Graham	Vann	GB13	The existing road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Access to the site will be dangerous due to the narrow roads.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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>It should be noted that the Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1699	Cathy and Graham	Vann	GB12	The local infrastructure will be under strain. The proposals are unsuitable and hope their views are taken into account.	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
1699	Cathy and Graham	Vann	GB13	The local infrastructure will be under strain. The proposals are unsuitable and hope their views are taken into account.	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
1699	Cathy and Graham	Vann	GB12	Object. The Green Belt should be preserved to prevent sprawl and to protect the countryside. This and the local views will be destroyed with the proposals.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 15.0.</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 countryside in the Borough. 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.</p> <p>The draft allocation notes specific mitigation measures within the key requirements that will need to be incorporated into the design of the development to mitigate any visual impacts and adjacent environmentally sensitive sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1699	Cathy and Graham	Vann	GB13	Object. The Green Belt should be preserved to prevent sprawl and to protect the countryside. This and the local views will be destroyed with the proposals.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 15.0.</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 countryside in the Borough. 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.</p> <p>The draft allocation notes specific mitigation measures within the key requirements that will need to be incorporated into the design of the development to mitigate any visual impacts and adjacent environmentally sensitive sites.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	On behalf of West Hall Ltd we write to support the draft Site Allocations DPD, with specific reference to GB15. The document is sound, having been positively prepared. Our client owns the site (since 1958).	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of	Comment 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
					associated infrastructure.		
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	We consider the indicative density of 40dph an appropriate starting point for a development in this location. To ensure proper planning, recognise the sensitivities of the wider area and accord with Policy CS10, this should be an average figure, to be reduced in the more sensitive parts of the site with potential to increase densities in less sensitive locations.	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.	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
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	The following summarises the key technical elements of the vision document: highly sustainable location; served by three bus regular routes; within walking distance of West Byfleet railway station; not visible in the wider landscape due to screening and topography; no impact on setting and significance of heritage assets; negligible effect on setting and significance of locally listed West Hall; mitigation measures will be included early on to ensure no adverse impacts on protected fauna; existing woodland will be managed to maximise ecological, arboricultural and recreational potential; no flooding or drainage. issues.	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the	The assessment of the benefits of the site is noted. It is important that the development of Green Belt sites is seen in the context of the spatial strategy for Woking set out in the Core Strategy. Sufficient brownfield land has been identified in the urban area to meet development needs up to 2022. The Council's preference will be for brownfield land to be developed before the release of Green Belt land. The time restriction for Green Belt land to be released should be retained.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.		
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	Note the site is proposed for development post 2022; whilst we are supportive of this approach, there is no reason why the site cannot be delivered ahead of that if it become apparent it is required. To ensure timely delivery, the policy should be amended to allow for infrastructure to serve the site to be provided in advance, subject to consents and licences. This will avoid delays to housing delivery on this site.	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.	The overall strategy of the Core Strategy is to focus most new development on previously developed land at the main centres where key services and facilities are readily available. The Core Strategy also acknowledges that Green Belt land will be needed to meet development needs between 2022 and 2027. The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet development needs. It has identified land to meet housing land supply until 2022 with some allowance for non-implementation. Consequently, and in accordance with the Core Strategy, the site should be released for development from 2022 in accordance with Policy SA1 of the Site Allocations DPD. The proposed density for the site is indicative and would apply as an average across the site but with a clear objective to make sure that the development would not compromise the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	We support the Site Allocations DPD which has been positively prepared, is effective, justified and fully complies with the Core Strategy and national policy guidance. The DPD is sound but we would welcome minor changes to the wording of policy GB15.	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to	Support note. Whilst the Council believes that the proposed densities are reasonable, it always said that they are indicative and that each proposal will be considered on their merits taken into account the characteristics of the site and its context. The overall spatial strategy for the Borough is set out in the Core Strategy. To ensure sustainable development the focus until 2022 is to concentrate most development on previously developed land within the main centres. Green Belt land will be release for development from 2022.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.		
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	Our client is fully committed to providing affordable housing, subject to it being viable to do so. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF is clear it is not unreasonable for a land owner developer to seek a competitive return to enable delivery. Core Strategy Policy CS12 acknowledges financial viability. The wording in GB15 should be amended to reflect the approved position within the Core Strategy or to refer to Policy CS12.	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.	The affordable housing requirement of Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy will apply. A case can be made on ground of viability if an applicant thinks that the requirement will make a scheme viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	Welcome the Council's commitment to progressing the DPD following adoption of the Core Strategy. Its commitment to meeting the full housing requirement whilst providing a buffer of additional (including safeguarded) sites demonstrates consistency with the NPPF and is supported. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) considers the reasonable alternatives, including alternatives to releasing land currently in the Green Belt. The SA fully considers likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors in line with NPPF.	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement	Support for the proposals 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
				The Core Strategy acknowledges the need to review Green Belt boundaries. The Green Belt review sets out where Green Belt boundaries should be amended and which sites should be brought forward for development. It is in full regard of the NPPF tests (paragraphs 80 and 83).	for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.		
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	<p>Fully support identification of our client's site (GB15). Its removal from the Green Belt would have no adverse impact on the five NPPF Green Belt purposes. The Council has identified the site lies in a highly sustainable location on the urban edge of the West Byfleet residential and service area. The site can deliver market and affordable housing in a sensitively designed, strong landscape environment.</p> <p>The site comprises agricultural fields with some wooded areas, part of the wider West Hall Estate (a mix of offices, nursery, a care home, residential properties, fields and woodland). The rest of the estate is not part of the proposal. Proposed policy GB15 sets out the key requirements, including the need for significant green infrastructure and public open space, affordable housing and an indicative density.</p>	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.	Support for the release of the Green Belt land to meet development needs is noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	We represent West Hall Ltd and attach the completed response form, supporting statement and a vision document for GB15. These demonstrate the potential for delivering 592 dwellings in sustainable integrated development.	Please see attached statement – we suggest a number of minor alterations	Comment 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
					and/or additions to the wording of the policy to reflect the requirement for flexibility in relation to the density of development and viability in relation to affordable housing. We also suggest clarification is provided in respect of the timescales for the release of the site for development and the provision of associated infrastructure.		
1206	Bhavash	Vashi	GB15	<p>Whilst we support the overall conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal, we have concerns and object in relation to GB15.</p> <p>Section 5 concerns improving accessibility to services and facilities and include a number of distances and walking cycling times from the site to various facilities. These distances do relate to the nearest services to the site which are:</p> <p>Nearest centre – West Byfleet within 500m, Byfleet within 1km</p> <p>Nearest GP – West Byfleet Health Centre within 1km, a 13 minute walk</p> <p>Nearest Secondary School – Fullbrook Secondary School within 1.7km, a 20 minute walk</p> <p>Nearest railway station – West Byfleet within 950m, a 12 minute walk</p> <p>The conclusions that the site is beyond reasonable walking distance of key services is incorrect and should be amended.</p>	The distances and walking times should be updated to reflect the actual position and the scoring for the site amended accordingly.	This point has been noted and amend will be made to the SA Report accordingly.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1096	Victoria	Vaughan	GB13	I fear this proposal is a foregone conclusion, such is the pressure on councils for new housing. As a concession to the release of land, whilst meeting the demands of the local planning strategy, there should be a condition of a commitment to a community facility provided by the developers to reflect the massive capital gain that would be made.	None stated.	The Council genuinely considers every representation and balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area. Brownfield 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 will make sure that the development is served by the necessary and justified infrastructure. Beyond CIL contribution, any contribution to address site specific infrastructure requirements will be determined at the planning application stage when a proposal comes forward and the suggested concession could be discussed as part of that discussion. Local residents will be consulted on any applications that comes forward.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1096	Victoria	Vaughan	GB12	I fear this proposal is a foregone conclusion, such is the pressure on councils for new housing. As a concession to the release of land, whilst meeting the demands of the local planning strategy, there should be a condition of a commitment to a community facility provided by the developers to reflect the massive capital gain that would be made.	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 commitment to any provision of infrastructure to serve the site specific needs of the development can only be justified on a case by case based on any proposal that comes forward. The comment is well 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
1096	Victoria	Vaughan	GB12	Question how carefully the plans have considered traffic increase, particularly road safety as people are encouraged to walk and cycle more. What of the school options for such a population increase? The village school is already oversubscribed, there is no additional capacity in its rebuild.	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
1096	Victoria	Vaughan	GB13	Question how carefully the plans have considered traffic increase, particularly road safety as people are encouraged to walk and cycle more. What of the school options for such a population increase? The village school is already oversubscribed, there is no additional capacity in its rebuild.	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
1096	Victoria	Vaughan	GB12	I fiercely object to the proposal to release Green Belt land south of Pyrford. This would gravely alter the character of the village.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1096	Victoria	Vaughan	GB13	I fiercely object to the proposal to release Green Belt land south of Pyrford. This would gravely alter the character of the village.	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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB7	Objects to the number of traveller pitches proposed due to there being three other pitches nearby, on a site that appears to have expanded.	None stated.	This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The DPD has not led to an increase in the number of Traveller sites in the Borough. It will however be intensifying the use of existing sites and the Council accepts that this will lead to an increase in the number of pitches and consequently Travellers population in this part of the Borough. The existing sites have so far been well managed and there is every indication that they will continue to be well managed when additional pitches are delivered. Based on the sequential approach, the Council believes that the proposed site allocations relatively offer the most sustainable locations to meet Travellers accommodation needs when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
29	Jenny	Velati	GB8	Believes there are no circumstances under which any land should be taken out of the Green Belt, particularly when there are brownfield sites available for development and renovation. Concern that if one Green Belt site is released, others will follow.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
29	Jenny	Velati	GB9	Believes there are no circumstances under which any land should be taken out of the Green Belt, particularly when there are brownfield sites available for development and renovation. Concern that if one Green Belt site is released, others will follow.	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 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB10	Believes there are no circumstances under which any land should be taken out of the Green Belt, particularly when there are brownfield sites available for development and renovation. Concern that if one Green Belt site is released, others will follow.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
29	Jenny	Velati	GB11	Believes there are no circumstances under which any land should be taken out of the Green Belt, particularly when there are brownfield sites available for development and renovation. Concern that if one Green Belt site is released, others will follow.	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 an assessment of the capacity of the urban area to meet development needs. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development needs over the entire plan period. This matter has been 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB8	Development would lead to felling of trees and hedgerows in order for there to be sufficient access points. This would reduce screening of housing, and increase their visibility, which would not be in keeping with the character of the area.	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposals will ensure the development of the sites incorporates the necessary green infrastructure and screening. The are robust design policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to ensure that the design of development is sympathetic to the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
29	Jenny	Velati	GB9	Development would lead to felling of trees and hedgerows in order for there to be sufficient access points. This would reduce screening of housing, and increase their visibility, which would not be in keeping with the character of the area.	None stated.	There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to make sure that development of the sites incorporate adequate and appropriate green infrastructure as part of any development. The key requirements of the proposals include this requirement as well.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
29	Jenny	Velati	GB10	Development would lead to felling of trees and hedgerows in order for there to be sufficient access points. This would reduce screening of housing, and increase their visibility, which would not be in keeping with the character 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. The are site specific requirements to ensure that the development of the site is in keeping with the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
29	Jenny	Velati	GB11	Development would lead to felling of trees and hedgerows in order for there to be sufficient access points. This would reduce screening of housing, and increase their visibility, which would not be in keeping with the character of the area.	None stated.	There are robust policies in the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD to protect trees where it would be necessary to do so.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
29	Jenny	Velati	GB8	The proposed development would add to traffic on Saunders Lane and Egley Road, where there is already congestion at certain times of day.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implication of the proposals are addressed 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB9	The proposed development would add to traffic on Saunders Lane and Egley Road, where there is already congestion at certain times of day.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implication of the proposals are addressed 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB10	The proposed development would add to traffic on Saunders Lane and Egley Road, where there is already congestion at certain times of day.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implication of the proposals are addressed 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB11	The proposed development would add to traffic on Saunders Lane and Egley Road, where there is already congestion at certain times of day.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implication of the proposals are addressed 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB8	Development would have a knock on effect on local infrastructure and services (schools, surgeries, hospitals, dentists). Mayford is full and does not have capacity for this development. Supports Mayford Village Society's response.	I urge you to re-consider your plans.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. Regarding 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB9	Development would have a knock on effect on local infrastructure and services (schools, surgeries, hospitals, dentists). Mayford is full and does not have capacity for this	I urge you to re-consider your plans.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. Regarding health provision, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development. Supports Mayford Village Society's response.		overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
29	Jenny	Velati	GB10	Development would have a knock on effect on local infrastructure and services (schools, surgeries, hospitals, dentists). Mayford is full and does not have capacity for this development. Supports Mayford Village Society's response.	I urge you to re-consider your plans.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. Regarding 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
29	Jenny	Velati	GB11	Development would have a knock on effect on local infrastructure and services (schools, surgeries, hospitals, dentists). Mayford is full and does not have capacity for this development. Supports Mayford Village Society's response.	I urge you to re-consider your plans.	The approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. Regarding 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
771	Peter	Velati	GB8	Based on most households having 2 cars, traffic will increase on Saunders Lane as will speeding. Local roads will become congested, including Egley Road.	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
771	Peter	Velati	GB9	Based on most households having 2 cars, traffic will increase on Saunders Lane as will speeding. Local roads will become congested, including Egley Road.	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.	
771	Peter	Velati	GB10	Based on most households having 2 cars, traffic will increase on Saunders Lane as will speeding. Local roads will become congested, including Egley Road.	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
771	Peter	Velati	GB11	Based on most households having 2 cars, traffic will increase on Saunders Lane as will speeding. Local roads will become congested, including Egley Road.	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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
771	Peter	Velati	GB8	Strongly object as the Green Belt should not be developed under any circumstances. There are existing brownfield sites available for development. Once one Green Belt site is released it opens the door for others.	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
771	Peter	Velati	GB9	Strongly object as the Green Belt should not be developed under any circumstances. There are existing brownfield sites available for development. Once one Green Belt site is released it opens the door for others.	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
771	Peter	Velati	GB10	Strongly object as the Green Belt should not be developed under any circumstances. There are existing brownfield sites available for development. Once one Green Belt site is released it opens the door for others.	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
771	Peter	Velati	GB11	Strongly object as the Green Belt should not be developed under any circumstances. There are existing brownfield sites available for development. Once one Green Belt site is released it opens the door for others.	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
771	Peter	Velati	GB7	Object to increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site as there are 3 other sites in close proximity. Hatchingtan has already expanded to the other side of the road.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0. A number of the sites identified in the DPD will require ground works to take place prior to commencement to development. The Council believe that subject to these works alongside the other key requirements set out in the DPD, the site is suitable for development and sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
771	Peter	Velati	GB8	Mayford is already full and any development would have a negative impact on local services and infrastructure. 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 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representer ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
771	Peter	Velati	GB9	Mayford is already full and any development would have a negative impact on local services and infrastructure. 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 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representer ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
771	Peter	Velati	GB10	Mayford is already full and any development would have a negative impact on local services and infrastructure. 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 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representer ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
771	Peter	Velati	GB11	Mayford is already full and any development would have a negative impact on local services and infrastructure. 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 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP and medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that needs to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
771	Peter	Velati	GB8	If the site is developed, most if not all, of the trees and hedgerows will be removed to create access points. This would have a negative visual impact on the character of the area which is mainly rural. There is no consideration to the inadequate services and infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site clear set out that a landscape assessment, ecological survey and tree survey are required to in order to protect and retain landscape features on the site. Many of the trees on the site are protected (TPO) and will be retained as part of any development of the site. In addition, it also states that there should be a careful design of layout to take into account vegetation forming the Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance to preserve integrity. The Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 provide robust policy to ensure that new development protects and where possible enhances the townscape and landscape character of the local context. This is further supported by the Design Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure and services 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
771	Peter	Velati	GB9	If the site is developed, most if not all, of the trees and hedgerows will be removed to create access points. This would have a negative visual impact on the character of the area which is mainly rural. There is no consideration to the inadequate services and infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site clear set out that a landscape assessment, ecological survey and tree survey are required to in order to protect and retain landscape features on the site. Many of the trees on the site are protected (TPO) and will be retained as part of any development of the site. In addition, it also states that there should be a careful design of layout to take into account vegetation forming the Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance to preserve integrity. The Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 provide robust policy to ensure that new development protects and where possible enhances the townscape and landscape character of the local context. This is further supported by the Design Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure and services 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
771	Peter	Velati	GB10	If the site is developed, most if not all, of the trees and hedgerows will be removed to create access points. This would have a negative visual impact on the character of the area which is mainly rural. There is no consideration to the inadequate services and infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site clear set out that a landscape assessment, ecological survey and tree survey are required to in order to protect and retain landscape features on the site. Many of the trees on the site are protected (TPO) and will be retained as part of any development of the site. In addition, it also states that there should be a careful design of layout to take into account vegetation forming the Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance to preserve integrity. The Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 provide robust policy to ensure that new development protects and where possible enhances the townscape and landscape character of the local context. This is further supported by the Design Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure and services 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
771	Peter	Velati	GB11	If the site is developed, most if not all, of the trees and hedgerows will be removed to create access points. This would have a negative visual impact on the character of the area which is mainly rural. There is no consideration to the inadequate services and infrastructure.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the site clear set out that a landscape assessment, ecological survey and tree survey are required to in order to protect and retain landscape features on the site. Many of the trees on the site are protected (TPO) and will be retained as part of any development of the site. In addition, it also states that there should be a careful design of layout to take into account vegetation forming the Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance to preserve integrity. The Core Strategy Policies CS21 and CS24 provide robust policy to ensure that new development protects and where possible enhances the townscape and landscape character of the local context. This is further supported by the Design Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure and services 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
319	H	Velissarides	General	There appears to be no significant proposal for improvements (except some pedestrian tunnels at Victoria Arch and rearrangement of the station forecourt) to increase the traffic flow within the Town Centre despite the significant development proposed for the area.	Suggestion of a Park and Ride service	<p>The Regulation 123 list includes the list of schemes to be delivered, by whom, when, how, at what cost and how it will be funded. This provides an indication of the priority infrastructure that the Council wishes to spend Community Infrastructure Levy contributions.</p> <p>A Park and Ride has been considered in the past, when it was decided that there was no radial route to build a critical mass for a Park and Ride to be effective. Nevertheless, the Council will continue to review this position on this.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
319	H	Velissarides	General	The rep highlights that it is impractical to make provision for development growth in the borough if it would make the Borough's roads impassable.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
319	H	Velissarides	General	There appears to be no coherent highway strategy for the borough. Consideration should be given to the effective design of new junctions to minimise costs and delays	There should be a coherent Highway Strategy for the Borough	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					and effective design of new junctions to minimise costs and delays		
319	H	Velissarides	General	Object to the proposals for the area unless the Highways Strategy is improved. The rep stresses the role of both SCC and WBC in ensuring this	Suggests an improved Highway Strategy	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
319	H	Velissarides	General	The rep suggests there has been limited highways work carried out in the borough for number of years. It notes some significant works in some areas but has highlighted the inefficiencies in most of these, e.g. -the 6 crossroads- missed opportunity for slip roads -Victoria Way-continues to experience congestion at Victoria Arch -Brookwood traffic lights- limited improvement to congestion -Maybury access to Sheerwater and Lockfield Drive- no connecting road to the 6 crossroads, leading to further tailbacks	None stated.	Improvement works have been carried out in the borough and although they may not address all the deficiencies they have played an essential part in alleviating some problems. The Council is by no means suggesting that the approach it has taken to mitigate development impacts of the Site Allocations DPD will be a panacea to address deficiencies in existing infrastructure provision. Nevertheless, it will ensure that the existing situation is not exacerbated and the negative impacts of any future development are minimised. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
319	H	Velissarides	General	The rep queries where the CIL contributions are spent, and questions how effective any of the proposed highway improvements would in fact address the traffic problems (e.g. increasing the number of cycle lanes)	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, particularly paragraph 3.3, Section 20 and Section 24.0 A Regulation 123 list is available on the Council's website which lists the priority infrastructure that the Council wishes to spend Community Infrastructure Levy contributions. This comprises transport schemes, including improvements to roads as well as cycle lanes, amongst other schemes.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB8	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB9	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB10	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB11	Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of "creating a defensible Green Belt boundary" – "strong" boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 and referred to in CS24) and therefore should not be considered for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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,	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
				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.			
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB8	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB9	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB10	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB11	The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area. This is misleading if that school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing development on fields either side.	None stated.	The site at Egley Road (Policy GB8) is allocated for housing and educational uses. There is therefore no intention to be misleading. The recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review support this decision. The Council believe that the site can be developed for a school and about 188 new homes without undermining the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB8	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB9	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB10	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB11	The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment, questioning the validity of the review and suggesting why areas of landscape importance have been ignored.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0. The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (eg owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Risk of flooding: The Council states in the DPD that it will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches in the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a). The Traveller Accommodation Assessment states that future expansion could be explored subject to overcoming any flooding issues. As 10% of the rear of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and a further 15% in Flood Zone 2, proposed pitches would be pushed closer to the road frontage, with unacceptable adverse impacts on visual amenity, openness	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and character.			
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Infrastructure, Services and Cost: the site does not have adequate infrastructure in line with Policy CS14, as it has no surface water or storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to current 'emergency vehicle' requirements, no water hydrant, site lighting, mains gas and minimal connection to water and electricity.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. This is further detailed in paragraph 4.10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused. The site has a boundary with a SSSI at Smarts Heath Common and Hoe Stream SNCI. An extended Traveller site would have an adverse impact on two environmentally sensitive sites.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council agrees with this comment, and indeed Policies CS7: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and CS8: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas reiterates the importance of protecting environmentally sensitive sites. Nevertheless, the Council is satisfied that the site can be development for the proposed use without significant damage to surrounding environmentally sensitive sites. This conclusion is supported by the available evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and the Landscape Assessment. None of the relevant environmental bodies such as Natural England have objected to the use of the site as a Traveller site on the basis of its potential significant impacts on environmentally sensitive sites. The site does not fall within any of the areas identified in the Green Belt boundary review report and the SA as absolute constraints. The Council is therefore confident that the site can be brought forward to deliver the necessary Traveller pitches to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers. The proposed allocations include a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as biodiversity are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	stated.	<p>minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review.</p> <p>The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.</p>	
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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. Working Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	The 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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream.</p> <p>This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Where a site is isolated from local facilities and is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended. Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, will not positively enhance the environment, increase its openness or respect or make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Paper, Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in Section 3.0 of this paper. In addition the Council's Core Strategy contains policies (including CS21) ensure that development is of a high quality of design that contributes positively to the street scene and local character.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in	The site should be removed from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Mayford.	the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	Successive Planning Inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	The site should be removed from	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3, and for further background, Section 1.0, particularly paragraphs 1.9 - 1.12. The proposed allocations are put forward in response to	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the DPD for the reasons stated.	need identified in the Council's Core Strategy (adopted 2012) and current supply of land, and through the plan-making (as opposed to development management) process.	
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB11	Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances' according to National Policy. This has not been proved. Policy clearly states that 'housing need - including Traveller sites' does not justify harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraphs 1.9-1.12.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB8	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB9	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB10	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB11	The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach of not considering certain areas of land, due to constraints. It then recommended land that contained these constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 10.0 and 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	The Green Belt Review rejected the site due to concerns over contamination, also detailed in the DPD. Contamination can be prohibitively expensive to remedy and should only be considered where financially viable. In its current potentially	The site should be removed from the DPD for	A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				contaminated state Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded traveller site. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered.	the reasons stated.	necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable. In some cases the proposed development would also offer a means to address the historic contamination issues on the site.	
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2, and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	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
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural streetscene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape grounds. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The impact on local character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 19.0. In addition, other development plan policies such as Policy CS21: Design and CS6: Green Belt of the Core Strategy will apply to the development of the site to minimise any adverse impacts on amenity and local character. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure that the development of the site is sustainable.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>The representation regarding the planning history of the site and the openness of the Green Belt has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1464	Bernadette	Verrier	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable	No further modification is 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 viable.	
107	Sue	Vlassopoulos	GB12	The proposals are completely against the interest of the respondents and people in the surrounding area	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
107	Sue	Vlassopoulos	GB12	Overdevelopment. There is insufficient space to accommodated new housing.	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. Whilst the Council acknowledges that every bit of Green Belt land is important to local residents and is worth protecting, overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including the sites in 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
107	Sue	Vlassopoulos	GB13	The proposals are completely against the interest of the respondents and people in the surrounding area	None stated.	The Council has not ignored the views of local residents. However, it has to balance that with its responsibility to meet the development needs of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
107	Sue	Vlassopoulos	GB13	Overdevelopment. There is insufficient space to accommodated new housing.	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 acknowledges that every bit of Green Belt land is important to the local community. However, overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including the sites in 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