

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1549	Salvatore	Raia	UA28	The estate roads are narrow and only one exit. It is not safe and development will make the situation worse.	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. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1549	Salvatore	Raia	UA28	The back garden was full of rubbish and investment has been put in into cleaning the site for residential use and the environment.	None stated.	It is noted that landowners have invested in improvements to their properties.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB4	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding and development will make the situation worse.	Terminate the project in accordance with the wishes of the local population and electorate.	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
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB5	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding and development will make the situation worse.	Terminate the project in accordance with the wishes of the local population and electorate.	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
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB15	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding and development will make the situation worse.	Terminate the project in accordance with the wishes of the local population and electorate.	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
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB16	The proposed area has previously flooded or is in danger of flooding and development will make the situation worse.	Terminate the project in accordance with the wishes of the local population and electorate.	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
770	Paul	Rainbird	General	Just don't go ahead with the project.	None stated.	Objection noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB4	The Green Belt must be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB5	The Green Belt must be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB15	The Green Belt must be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB16	The Green Belt must be preserved	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
							of this representation
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB4	The proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet should not proceed. The A245 and infrastructure cannot cope at present and further development will make the situation worse.	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. Section 3.0 also sets out the Council's response to infrastructure generally.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB5	The proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet should not proceed. The A245 and infrastructure cannot cope at present and further development will make the situation worse.	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. Section 3.0 also sets out the Council's response to infrastructure generally.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB15	The proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet should not proceed. The A245 and infrastructure cannot cope at present and further development will make the situation worse.	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. Section 3.0 also sets out the Council's response to infrastructure generally.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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>	
770	Paul	Rainbird	GB16	The proposals in Byfleet and West Byfleet should not proceed. The A245 and infrastructure cannot cope at present and further development will make the situation worse.	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. Section 3.0 also sets out the Council's response to infrastructure generally.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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
1608	Susan	Randall	GB16	The drainage and pumping stations can not cope and will be worse if the proposals take place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1608	Susan	Randall	GB15	The drainage and pumping stations can not cope and will be worse if the proposals take place.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1608	Susan	Randall	GB16	Do not have the road infrastructure to support an increase in traffic. The A245 is congested already. A 1997 transport report on the A245 showed that it could not support any further development and was endorsed by the Secretary of State. WBC and SCC reports show that the Level of Service is 'F' whilst the ratio to flow shows extensive queuing. There will also be an impact on surrounding road in the area.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various up to date transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Mitigation measures including a roundabout will not be suitable for the road.		<p>site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The key requirements for Site GB15 note that a roundabout should be provided in order to achieve a safe entrance onto the site from Parvis Road. This is based on the findings of the County Highways Authority who are responsible for the highways in the area as well as highways safety</p>	
1608	Susan	Randall	GB16	<p>The proposed 700 houses and independent school would result in 90% of Green Belt lost in West Byfleet. Whilst more affordable houses are needed for younger people, there are a number of concerns.</p> <p>The Broadoaks proposal would only provide a small number of affordable homes, whilst most would be at a high price. WBC have already approved these plans and surprised as they do not meet affordable housing requirements. The West Hall site floods in heavy rain and concerned about the flood risk once developed on, including an increase risk to others. The Council do not seem concerned about flooding. The impact will be huge on a small community.</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council has decided through the Core Strategy that the significant unmet need for housing justifies the need to release Green Belt land for housing development. In doing so it is important that development is directed to the most sustainable locations of the Borough. It is within this broad spatial strategy context that sites are allocated for development. To clarify, the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 43.5% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of West Byfleet. Excluding site GB23 which will not be developed and will continue to provide open space and sports provision for the Junior and Infant schools, the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in West Byfleet is 37.8% (45ha). Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents over the loss of Green Belt, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation need 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. The amount of affordable housing proposed by the developer will be a material consideration in the determination on the application.</p> <p>The representation regarding flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p> <p>There is no doubt that development of Broadoaks and West Hall (GB15 and GB16) will significantly increase the population of West Byfleet. 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
1608	Susan	Randall	GB16	West Byfleet is one of several villages that WBC wish to develop in but the other villages are close together and will all impact on residents way of life. Although it is important to provide younger people with opportunities to get onto the housing ladder, it should not come at the expense of all villages in the borough. There are a number of empty office buildings that can be converted into affordable flats. There is also an area of Green Belt next to Horsell Birch that could accommodate more houses with little impact on the road	A number of vacant office buildings should be considered for affordable flats. The Green Belt next to Horsell	<p>The representation regarding the reuse of office accommodation for residential uses has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0.</p> <p>The Council note the suggestion for development near Horsell Birch. This site was ruled out for development by the Green Belt boundary review as part of the site falls within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, an international wildlife designation. The adjacent areas of Green Belt along Horsell Birch are within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Zone A, where residential development is not permitted under the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy. This area of land is also designated Common Land and SNCI.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				network. Do not oppose to 150 homes at Broadoaks but do not support the school. Hope that an amicable compromise can be reached as the current plans are excessive and in a location that can not entertain any further disruption.	Birch could accommodate houses with little impact on the road network.	<p>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 need of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council agree with the representation regarding the delivery of home and affordable homes within the Borough. All of the sites within the draft DPD set out the affordable housing threshold required as part of any future development.</p>	
1608	Susan	Randall	GB15	West Byfleet is one of several villages that WBC wish to develop in but the other villages are close together and will all impact on residents way of life. Although it is important to provide younger people with opportunities to get onto the housing ladder, it should not come at the expense of all villages in the borough. There are a number of empty office buildings that can be converted into affordable flats. There is also an area of Green Belt next to Horsell Birch that could accommodate more houses with little impact on the road network. Do not oppose to 150 homes at Broadoaks but do not support the school. Hope that an amicable compromise can be reached as the current plans are excessive and in a location that can not entertain any further disruption.	A number of vacant office buildings should be considered for affordable flats. The Green Belt next to Horsell Birch could accommodate houses with little impact on the road network.	<p>The representation regarding the reuse of office accommodation for residential uses has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0.</p> <p>The Council note the suggestion for development near Horsell Birch. This site was ruled out for development by the Green Belt boundary review as part of the site falls within the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, an international wildlife designation. The adjacent areas of Green Belt along Horsell Birch are within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Zone A, where residential development is not permitted under the TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy. This area of land is also designated Common Land and SNCI.</p> <p>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 need of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The Council agree with the representation regarding the delivery of home and affordable homes within the Borough. All of the sites within the draft DPD set out the affordable housing threshold required as part of any future development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1608	Susan	Randall	GB16	Primary schools are at capacity and should be more of a priority than an independent school. There is also a new senior school being built a few miles away at the moment.	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
1608	Susan	Randall	GB15	Primary schools are at capacity and should be more of a priority than an independent school. There is also a new senior school being built a few miles away at the moment.	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
1608	Susan	Randall	GB16	The health centre is at capacity and unable to accommodate further patients.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1608	Susan	Randall	GB15	The health centre is at capacity and unable to accommodate further patients.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1608	Susan	Randall	GB16	There will be significant upheaval locally when other sites are brought forward for development including Pyrford, Byfleet and Sheerwater.	None stated.	It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution. It should be noted that the proposed site allocations in Byfleet and Pyrford (GB4, GB5, GB12 and GB13) are safeguarded sites and not proposed for development until after 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1528	Marie	Randazzo	UA28	Wants to ensure that we will keep our back access to our garden. Please confirm in writing. On previous consultation this was agreed.	None stated.	This detail will be confirmed at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB12	The Council appear to be avoiding collect objective from the Pyrford NF.	None stated.	As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB13	The Council appear to be avoiding collect objective from the Pyrford NF.	None stated.	As noted at the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by LDA Design on behalf of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken the response by LDA Design into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB12	Concerned that development on the sites will set a precedence and eventually Pyrford will be joined up with Ripley.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. The proposed Green Belt boundary is considered to be robust and defensible and will ensure beyond the plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB13	Concerned that development on the sites will set a precedence and eventually Pyrford will be joined up with Ripley.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. The proposed Green Belt boundary is considered to be robust and defensible and will ensure beyond the plan period.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB12	The additional dwellings will ruin the rural village environment residents enjoy.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment and requires development to be built to high design standards.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB13	The additional dwellings will ruin the rural village environment residents enjoy.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0. The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that development does not have unacceptable impacts on the environment and requires development to be built to high design standards.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB12	Local shopping facilities are limited. The health centre is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Questions how residents will benefit from the increased population.	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 Pyrford form the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocation of this site is within walking and cycling distance of the Neighbourhood Centre and therefore will help meet the day to day need of local people and reduce the need to travel by car. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						not be significantly undermined.	
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB13	Local shopping facilities are limited. The health centre is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Questions how residents will benefit from the increased population.	None stated.	<p>It is agreed that all types of new residential development should have good access to local shops and services. The existing shops in Pyrford form the Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocation of this site is within walking and cycling distance of the Neighbourhood Centre and therefore will help meet the day to day need of local people and reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB12	There are other more suitable areas for development in the Borough and should be used before Green Belt. Please reconsider your plans and keep Pyrford a rural village.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding suitable alternative sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0</p> <p>With regards to the character of Pyrford, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB13	There are other more suitable areas for development in the Borough and should be used before Green Belt. Please reconsider your plans and keep Pyrford a rural village.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding suitable alternative sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0</p> <p>With regards to the character of Pyrford, please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, 21.0 and 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB12	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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,</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education need 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 need of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified. The Council would also encourage existing and proposed schools to introduce or improve existing pedestrian and cycling facilities to reduce the need to travel by car and promote sustainable travel methods.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p>	
1028	Malcolm	Rapps	GB13	The road network is already at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the main provider of Education in the area. It provided detailed assessment of education need 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 need of the area. In addition, there is the likelihood of further education provision coming forward on the back of the Government's free school initiative if the need can be justified. The Council would also encourage existing and proposed schools to introduce or improve existing pedestrian and cycling facilities to reduce the need to travel by car and promote sustainable travel methods.</p> <p>It is noted that there will be some disruption during the construction period of the named sites. Nevertheless this will be taken into account at the planning application stage in order to minimise the disruption on local communities, including noise, dust, traffic and air pollution.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1581	C.E.	Ratcliff	GB12	Object to development proposal and as Green Belt land should be protected from development.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1581	C.E.	Ratcliff	GB13	Object to development proposal and as Green Belt land should be protected from development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB12	We are alarmed at the proposal to destroy precious Green Belt and permanently change the semi-rural nature of our community. Whilst accepting the need to increase housing stock, the additional demands on infrastructure will not be met, straining our existing overburdened road. Proposed development in around Guildford will also impact traffic in Pyrford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. Based on the evidence, the Council is satisfied that the proposals can be development without significantly undermining the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB13	We are alarmed at the proposal to destroy precious Green Belt and permanently change the semi-rural nature of our community. Whilst accepting the need to increase housing stock, the additional demands on infrastructure will not be met, straining our existing overburdened road. Proposed development in around Guildford will also impact traffic in Pyrford.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB12	Expansion of this scale would transform a pleasant village atmosphere into an urbanised environment and degrade quality of life. Your proposals should be resisted at all costs.	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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB13	Expansion of this scale would transform a pleasant village atmosphere into an urbanised environment and degrade quality of life. Your proposals should be resisted at all costs.	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 need 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 to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB12	Where will you educate the increased number of children?	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB13	Where will you educate the increased number of children?	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to serve the proposals, including schools is comprehensively addressed by Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB13	We have existing problems with water supply during periods of peak demand, this situation will be exacerbated by the proposals.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to assess the scale of infrastructure needed to support development. There will be sufficient water to support the projected growth. The Council also has robust policies such as Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy to minimise water consumption of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1105	Norman Patricia	Ratcliffe	GB12	We have existing problems with water supply during periods of peak demand, this situation will be exacerbated by the proposals.	None stated.	The Council has carried out an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the overall development in the area. Based on the evidence, there is be sufficient water to support the projected growth. Nevertheless, the Council has robust policies such as Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy to minimise water consumption as a result of development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB8	Ten Acre Farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common SSSI used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Increased use of the site would decrease visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity. Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.	Please reconsider your plans	<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 ground. 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. The justification for the use of Green Belt land to meet the accommodation need of Travellers is addressed in detail in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB11	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB19, GB11 and GB14. There are no plans to upgrade the road (some of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. There will be gridlock.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any planning application and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the sites are sustainable. The representation about lack of buses in the area is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand that will result from the development on the back of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand. Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses how the transport implications of the proposals are assessed and/or will be addressed. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the development in the area will require traffic mitigation measures, this can be addressed as part of the planning application process. The key requirements of the proposals requests for detailed transport assessment to be carried out to inform any planning application for the development of the site. The Council will work with the County Council to make sure that this is carried to the required standards and any adverse impacts mitigated	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
239	Paul	Raven	GB10	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB19, GB11 and GB14. There are no plans to upgrade the road (some of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. There will be gridlock.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB8	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB19, GB11 and GB14. There are no plans to upgrade the road (some of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. There will be gridlock.	Please reconsider your plans	<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 Section 1, 3 and 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
239	Paul	Raven	GB9	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB19, GB11 and GB14. There are no plans to upgrade the road (some of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. There will be gridlock.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
239	Paul	Raven	GB14	I strongly object to the proposed housing on GB8, GB9, GB19, GB11 and GB14. There are no plans to upgrade the road (some of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (all single lane) or solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. There will be gridlock.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
239	Paul	Raven	GB10	Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous with increased traffic, there are no pavements and Worplesdon train car park lacks capacity. 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 reconsider your plans	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB11	Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous with increased traffic, there are no pavements and Worplesdon train car park lacks capacity. 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 reconsider your plans	<p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
239	Paul	Raven	GB14	Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous with increased traffic, there are no pavements and Worplesdon train car park lacks capacity. 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 reconsider your plans	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB9	Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous with increased traffic, there are no pavements and Worplesdon train car park lacks capacity. 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 reconsider your plans	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible. The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with	No further modification is 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 County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	
239	Paul	Raven	GB8	Prey Heath Road will become more dangerous with increased traffic, there are no pavements and Worplesdon train car park lacks capacity. 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 reconsider your plans	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network. The evidence set out in detail in Section 7, 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper demonstrates that the distinctiveness of Mayford will not be significantly undermined by the proposals. Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected heathlands (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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.	
239	Paul	Raven	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	Please reconsider your plans	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB7	I strongly object. All of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the borough and Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	Please reconsider your plans	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
239	Paul	Raven	GB9	The plans will bring congestion and have a negative impact on Woking and Guildford residents using Egley Road to commute or on school run. When did the Council conduct road traffic studies (request details).	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB10	The plans will bring congestion and have a negative impact on Woking and Guildford residents using Egley Road to commute or on school run. When did the Council conduct road traffic studies (request details).	Please reconsider your plans	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB11	The plans will bring congestion and have a negative impact on Woking and Guildford residents using Egley Road to commute or on school run. When did the Council conduct road traffic studies (request details).	Please reconsider your plans	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB14	The plans will bring congestion and have a negative impact on Woking and Guildford residents using Egley Road to commute or on school run. When did the Council conduct road traffic studies (request details).	Please reconsider your plans	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB8	The plans will bring congestion and have a negative impact on Woking and Guildford residents using Egley Road to commute or on school run. When did the Council conduct road traffic studies (request details).	Please reconsider your plans	The overall approach to addressing the traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in detail in Sections 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
239	Paul	Raven	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. Already there is heavy traffic on Egley Road with new developments in Westfield Road and Moor Lane yet to take effect.	Please reconsider your plans	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). In addition, all of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the sites, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will be fully assessed as part of any planning application and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the sites are sustainable. The representation about lack of buses in the area is acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand that will result from the development on the back of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand. Section 20 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper addresses how the transport implications of the proposals are assessed and/or will be addressed. Whilst the Council acknowledges that the development in the area will require traffic mitigation measures, this can be addressed as part of the planning application process. The key requirements of the proposals requests for detailed transport assessment to be carried out to inform any planning application for the development of the site. The Council will work with the County Council to make sure that this is carried to the required standards and any adverse impacts mitigated	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. Already there is heavy traffic on Egley Road with new developments in Westfield Road and Moor Lane yet to take effect.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
239	Paul	Raven	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse.	Please reconsider your plans	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst</p>	No further modification is 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 is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
239	Paul	Raven	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. There are existing traffic problems on Egley Road. We have yet to see the traffic impact of the Moor Lane housing development. Additional homes in the wider area will make the situation worse.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
239	Paul	Raven	GB14	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure that the increased population will result in. There will be more cars and traffic. Already there is heavy traffic on Egley Road with new developments in Westfield Road and Moor Lane yet to take effect.	Please reconsider your plans	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need 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 Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB7	The site is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, used for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to domestic animals in close proximity.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. 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>	
620	Anna	Raven	GB7	Objects to the proposal. Currently, Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution 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
620	Anna	Raven	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.	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
620	Anna	Raven	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.	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
620	Anna	Raven	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.	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
620	Anna	Raven	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.	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
620	Anna	Raven	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.	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
620	Anna	Raven	GB8	Interested in receiving details and seeing the results of any road traffic studies conducted at rush hours on local road, particularly on Egley Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB9	Interested in receiving details and seeing the results of any road traffic studies conducted at rush hours on local road, particularly on Egley Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB10	Interested in receiving details and seeing the results of any road traffic studies conducted at rush hours on local road, particularly on Egley Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB11	Interested in receiving details and seeing the results of any road traffic studies conducted at rush hours on local road, particularly on Egley Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB14	Interested in receiving details and seeing the results of any road traffic studies conducted at rush hours on local road, particularly on Egley Road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 20.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB8	Expects WBC to look after the interests and wellbeing of its residents, which are currently being neglected. The proposals will have a negative impact for residents of Woking, Mayford, Guildford and surrounding villages.	None stated.	The 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB9	Expects WBC to look after the interests and wellbeing of its residents, which are currently being neglected. The	None stated.	The 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposals will have a negative impact for residents of Woking, Mayford, Guildford and surrounding villages.			of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB10	Expects WBC to look after the interests and wellbeing of its residents, which are currently being neglected. The proposals will have a negative impact for residents of Woking, Mayford, Guildford and surrounding villages.	None stated.	The 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB11	Expects WBC to look after the interests and wellbeing of its residents, which are currently being neglected. The proposals will have a negative impact for residents of Woking, Mayford, Guildford and surrounding villages.	None stated.	The 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB14	Expects WBC to look after the interests and wellbeing of its residents, which are currently being neglected. The proposals will have a negative impact for residents of Woking, Mayford, Guildford and surrounding villages.	None stated.	The 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	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
620	Anna	Raven	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	No further modification is 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 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).	
620	Anna	Raven	GB11	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	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
620	Anna	Raven	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
620	Anna	Raven	GB8	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.		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.	of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB9	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB10	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	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. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB8	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB9	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB10	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB11	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB14	Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
620	Anna	Raven	GB8	The plans will have a negative impact on both Woking and Guildford residents who use Egley Road to commute or take children to school. The resulting congestion will make travel times unreasonable.	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
620	Anna	Raven	GB9	The plans will have a negative impact on both Woking and Guildford residents who use Egley Road to commute or take children to school. The resulting congestion will make travel times unreasonable.	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
620	Anna	Raven	GB10	The plans will have a negative impact on both Woking and Guildford residents who use Egley Road to commute or take children to school. The resulting congestion will make travel times unreasonable.	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>	
620	Anna	Raven	GB11	The plans will have a negative impact on both Woking and Guildford residents who use Egley Road to commute or take children to school. The resulting congestion will make travel times unreasonable.	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
620	Anna	Raven	GB14	The plans will have a negative impact on both Woking and Guildford residents who use Egley Road to commute or take children to school. The resulting congestion will make travel times unreasonable.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
620	Anna	Raven	GB8	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Astonished at the lack of awareness of the existing gridlock on Egley Road at peak times. It is irresponsible of the Council to propose further development along this road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB9	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Astonished at the lack of awareness of the existing gridlock on Egley Road at peak times. It is irresponsible of the Council to propose further development along this road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB10	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Astonished at the lack of awareness of the existing gridlock on Egley Road at peak times. It is irresponsible of the Council to propose further development along this road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB11	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Astonished at the lack of awareness of the existing gridlock on Egley Road at peak times. It is irresponsible of the Council to propose further development along this road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
620	Anna	Raven	GB14	There has been no consideration of the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic on Egley Road. Astonished at the lack of awareness of the existing gridlock on Egley Road at peak times. It is irresponsible of the Council to propose further development along this road.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding 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
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	The government's open door immigration policy resulting in a housing crisis isn't enough reason to compromise the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council is proposing these sites for allocation to meet its own development requirements, which are set in the Core Strategy 2012. Further detail on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0. Background evidence shows that most of the housing need in the Borough is internally generated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	The government's open door immigration policy resulting in a housing crisis isn't enough reason to compromise the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	The Council is proposing these sites for allocation to meet its own development requirements, which are set in the Core Strategy 2012. Further detail on this can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 1.0. Background evidence shows that most of the housing need in the Borough is internally generated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	Suggests the Council pursues ways to increase the density of existing housing stock, to cater for actual need in Pyrford (i.e. aged care and provision to enable downsizing to free up housing for families).	The Council should pursue ways to increase the density of housing stock in Pyrford, to meet actual need (for aged care and for those wishing	Meeting the need of the Borough's population will be key to delivery of these sites, with a key requirement on affordable housing within the draft allocation, and a housing mix that would need to be considered appropriate with regard to Core Strategy Policies CS11 Housing Mix, CS12 Affordable housing and CS13 Older people and vulnerable groups.	No further modification is 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 downsize their home).		
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	Suggests the Council pursues ways to increase the density of existing housing stock, to cater for actual need in Pyrford (i.e. aged care and provision to enable downsizing to free up housing for families).	The Council should pursue ways to increase the density of housing stock in Pyrford, to meet actual need (for aged care and for those wishing to downsize their home).	Meeting the need of the Borough's population will be key to delivery of these sites, with a key requirement on affordable housing within the draft allocation, and a housing mix that would need to be considered appropriate with regard to Core Strategy Policies CS11 Housing Mix, CS12 Affordable housing and CS13 Older people and vulnerable groups.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	Objects to the proposal for the following reasons. Pyrford is a historic village that has retained its character through deliberate restriction of development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0 and 23.0. 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
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	Objects to the proposal for the following reasons. Pyrford is a historic village that has retained its character through deliberate restriction of development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 19.0 and 23.0. 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
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	Natural surroundings are important contributors to well-being, quality of life, mental health.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	Natural surroundings are important contributors to well-being, quality of life, mental health.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	Outlines the Pyrford Forum's concerns raised in letters about the Green Belt Review, and their advisors attempts to address Borough Executive. They are repulsed that the Executive proceeded to take the decision to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. Efforts should be made to address these concerns and ensure future representations are treated in a fair and transparent manner. Otherwise future planning could be reasonably affected by disputes and challenges, made on a good basis.	None stated.	As noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, and by LDA Design on their behalf, should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken these representations into account as part of the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor I 19 and 573. Responding to this (Regulation 18) consultation is the correct method and time for residents, groups and all other stakeholders to voice their concerns.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	Outlines the Pyrford Forum's concerns raised in letters about the Green Belt Review, and their advisors attempts to address Borough Executive. They are repulsed that the Executive proceeded to take the decision to publish the DPD without reviewing valid representations. Efforts should be made to address these concerns and ensure future	None stated.	As noted the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. Therefore the issues raised by Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum, and by LDA Design on their behalf, should be considered as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. The Council has taken these representations into account as part of the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor I 19 and 573. Responding to this (Regulation 18) consultation 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
				representations are treated in a fair and transparent manner. Otherwise future planning could be reasonably affected by disputes and challenges, made on a good basis.		the correct method and time for residents, groups and all other stakeholders to voice their concerns.	
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	Suggests the Council pursue ways to make the green open space more widely available to the public, as recreation facilities, but not funded by selling Green Belt to developers.	Suggests the Council pursue ways to make the green open space more widely available to the public as recreation facilities, but not by selling the Green Belt to developers.	The provision of open space and green infrastructure to encourage recreation and more active lifestyles is encouraged in the Council's Core Strategy, Policy CS17. This policy would apply to any proposed development. Also, key requirements for the site note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Furthermore the Council is proposing a number of sites through this consultation document for green infrastructure, to meet the open space and recreational need of the Borough's residents now and in the future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	Suggests the Council pursue ways to make the green open space more widely available to the public, as recreation facilities, but not funded by selling Green Belt to developers.	Suggests the Council pursue ways to make the green open space more widely available to the public as recreation facilities, but not by selling the Green Belt to developers.	The provision of open space and green infrastructure to encourage recreation and more active lifestyles is encouraged in the Council's Core Strategy, Policy CS17. This policy would apply to any proposed development. Also, key requirements for the site note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. Furthermore the Council is proposing a number of sites through this consultation document for green infrastructure, to meet the open space and recreational need of the Borough's residents now and in the future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	Pyrford has poor road infrastructure, with particular issues at school drop off and pick up times. This would be worsened by the proposed development and further compounded by development proposed by Guildford at Send, Ripley and Wisley.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. The Council has engaged with Guildford Borough Council, and other neighbouring authorities, in the preparation of this document, through this consultation and in line with the (nationally set) Duty to Cooperate. It will continue to work to ensure that the plans for the two Boroughs are well integrated and do not lead to negative impacts for local residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	Pyrford has poor road infrastructure, with particular issues at school drop off and pick up times. This would be worsened by the proposed development and further compounded by development proposed by Guildford at Send, Ripley and Wisley.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0. The Council has engaged with Guildford Borough Council, and other neighbouring authorities, in the preparation of this document, through this consultation and in line with the (nationally set) Duty to Cooperate. It will continue to work to ensure that the plans for the two Boroughs are well integrated and do not lead to negative impacts for local residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	Green Belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl, which is being proposed here. Once green space is developed it is unheard of to reverse the trend.	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 need 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
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	Green Belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl, which is being proposed here. Once green space is developed it is unheard of to reverse the trend.	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 need 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
1491	Frank	Ray	GB12	The green spaces surrounding Pyrford ensures and supports a wide variety of important 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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>	
1491	Frank	Ray	GB13	The green spaces surrounding Pyrford ensures and supports a wide variety of important 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Object to proposed changes to the GB. The changes will have a major impact on Mayford and the surrounding areas	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" There is no justification for the proposals in the GB in Mayford	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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Documentation should be provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites and other GB sites have been considered e.g. golf courses by the Town Centre. WBC have only considered sites owned by developers and not necessarily the most appropriate sites (e.g. access to	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 Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Land ownership</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				town centre, shops, medical facilities)			
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	The GB in Mayford provides a fundamental separation of Woking and Guildford. Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will risk coalescence of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. This matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will be undermined by the proposals. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will set a precedence for further development	None stated.	The Council believes that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary. 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs (Special Sites of Scientific Interest) and should have 400m buffers to protect them from encroaching development. Has this been considered?	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 Smarts Heath as Spa, it is not yet a designated SPA and the 400m exclusion zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council has robust policies to protect SSSIs (Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy)	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	There is an increased risk on wildlife, or complete loss of wildlife on protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of proposed development, including the increase of traveller pitches	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Ten Acre Farm: over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Why should it be considered now?	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance and should not be considered for development. Why has it?	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Land North of Saunders Lane is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. During wet seasons, the land is saturated with water, providing flood relieve for houses along Saunders Lane. How will surface water be treated? What measures will be	None stated.	The Council's collective evidence as set out in detail in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper justifies the allocation of sites along Saunders Lane. The justification for the release of the sites from the Green Belt to meet future development need is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matters is addressed in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				put in place if development goes ahead		is addressed comprehensively in Sections 7 and 23 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the character of the area will be significantly undermined by the proposals.	
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Saunders Lane is 1.2mi long, with no public transport, narrow road, few lampposts, missing footpaths, no cycle lane and a one lane rail bridge. There is no study that identifies traffic mitigation/improvement measures to cater for an additional 500 homes and respective vehicles	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Mayford has no supporting infrastructure including shops, medical centres, schools to support the new housing.	None stated.	The approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Worplesdon Station is only accessible by vehicle. There are no pedestrian footpaths, is a very narrow road, accessible under/over one lane bridges seen any. There is no documentation that take into account the difficulty to access the station and how to improve the infrastructure to cope with an increase use of the station.	None stated.	The Council is working with South West Trains, Network Rail and the County Council to improve facilities and infrastructure at railway stations in the Borough including Worplesdon Station.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	The methodology in the GB Review Study which informs the proposed changes to the GB is questionable	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied. The Council has used a range of evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal to inform the DPD. The collectively justify the allocation of the prop	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Queries the process of releasing land. WBC are releasing land and considering the consequences (inefficient infrastructure, flooding problems, overcrowding, loss of biodiversity, lack of facilities) later. WBC should consider the suitability of the land in line with national policy first. It should provide landscape, environmental, infrastructure assessments etc. before considering the release of GB land for development	None stated.	The Council has carried out a number of evidence base studies to support the proposals, including landscape assessment, flood risk assessment and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a sustainability appraisal. The list of evidence base is at Appendix of the Site Allocation DPD. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	Information on the Site Allocations DPD consultation has been a real challenge -A complicated website -Online material is difficult to read -Biased leaflet ("WBC MUST, rather than SHOULD...")	None stated.	The Council will continue to explore opportunities to improve how it communicates its proposals in the future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>-poorly presented public consultations</p> <p>-Unclear displays</p> <p>Requests the existing information and methodology for the release of the GB be reviewed.</p>			
80	Crista	Rayner	GB7	The Site Allocations Development Plan will have a devastating impact on the Villages surrounded by the Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. 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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Object to proposed changes to the GB. The changes will have a major impact on Mayford and the surrounding areas	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	<p>National policy states hat Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances"</p> <p>There is no justification for the proposals in the GB in Mayford</p>	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	<p>Documentation should be provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites and other GB sites have been considered e.g. golf courses by the Town Centre.</p> <p>WBC have only considered sites owned by developers and not necessarily the most appropriate sites (e.g. access to town centre, shops, medical facilities)</p>	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	The GB in Mayford provides a fundamental separation of Woking and Guildford. Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will risk coalescence of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will set a precedence for further 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 Council believes that the proposal will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs (Special Sites of Scientific Interest) and should have 400m buffers to protect them from encroaching development. Has this been considered?	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 Smarts Heath as SPA. The 400m zone cannot apply because this is not designated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	There is an increased risk on wildlife, or complete loss of wildlife on protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of proposed development, including the increase of traveller pitches	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 ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Ten Acre Farm: over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Why should it be considered now?	None stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance and should not be considered for development. Why has it?	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. During wet seasons, the land is saturated with water, providing flood relieve for houses along Saunders Lane. How will surface water be treated? What measures will be put in place if development goes ahead	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Saunders Lane is 1.2mi long, with no public transport, narrow road, few lampposts, missing footpaths, no cycle lane and a one lane rail bridge. There is no study that identifies traffic mitigation/improvement measures to cater for an additional 500 homes and respective vehicles	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	No further modification is 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 is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Mayford has no supporting infrastructure including shops, medical centres, schools to support the new housing.	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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Worplesdon Station is only accessible by vehicle. There are no pedestrian footpaths, is a very narrow road, accessible under/over one lane bridges seen any. There is no documentation that take into account the difficulty to access the station and how to improve the infrastructure to cope with an increase use of the station.	None stated.	As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	The methodology in the GB Review Study which informs the proposed changes to the GB is questionable	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied. The matter is addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Queries the process of releasing land. WBC are releasing land and considering the consequences (inefficient infrastructure, flooding problems, overcrowding, loss of biodiversity, lack of facilities) later. WBC should consider the suitability of the land in line with national policy first. It should provide landscape, environmental, infrastructure assessments etc. before considering the release of GB land for development	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2, 4. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	Information on the Site Allocations DPD consultation has been a real challenge -A complicated website -Online material is difficult to read -Biased leaflet ("WBC MUST, rather than SHOULD...") -poorly presented public consultations -Unclear displays Requests the existing information and methodology for the	None stated.	The Council will continue to explore opportunities to improve how it communicates its proposals in the future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				release of the GB be reviewed.			
80	Crista	Rayner	GB8	The Site Allocations Development Plan will have a devastating impact on the Villages surrounded by the Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. 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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Object to proposed changes to the GB. The changes will have a major impact on Mayford and the surrounding areas	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	National policy states hat Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" There is no justification for the proposals in the GB in 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Documentation should be provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites and other GB sites have been considered e.g. golf courses by the Town Centre. WBC have only considered sites owned by developers and not necessarily the most appropriate sites (e.g. access to town centre, shops, medical facilities)	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	The GB in Mayford provides a fundamental separation of Woking and Guildford. Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will risk coalescence of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are underpinned by an assessment of the landscape implications for developing the sites. The Council is satisfied that the landscape character and setting of the area will not be undermined as a result of the proposals. this matter is clarified in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 7. The overall character and heritage assets of the area will also not be significantly undermined. These are addressed in detail in Sections 23 and 19 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will set a precedence for further development	None stated.	The Council believes that the proposal will ultimately ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs (Special Sites of Scientific Interest) and should have 400m buffers to protect them from encroaching development. Has this been considered?	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 Smarts Heath as SPA, it is not yet designated. Consequently, the 400m zone cannot apply. Nevertheless, the Council attaches significant importance to the protection of the SSSI and Policy SC7 of the Core Strategy will help achieve that.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	There is an increased risk on wildlife, or complete loss of wildlife on protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of proposed development, including the increase of traveller pitches	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Ten Acre Farm: over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Why should it be considered now?	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance and should not be considered for development. Why has it?	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. During wet seasons, the land is saturated with water, providing flood relieve for houses along Saunders Lane. How will surface water be treated? What measures will be put in place if development goes ahead	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, the key requirements to make any development of the sites acceptable includes to manage surface water run off. This includes the introduction of Sustainable Drainage Systems.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Saunders Lane is 1.2mi long, with no public transport, narrow road, few lampposts, missing footpaths, no cycle lane and a one lane rail bridge. There is no study that identifies traffic mitigation/improvement measures to cater for an additional 500 homes and respective vehicles	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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Mayford has no supporting infrastructure including shops, medical centres, schools to support the new housing.	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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Worplesdon Station is only accessible by vehicle. There are no pedestrian footpaths, is a very narrow road, accessible under/over one lane bridges seen any. There is no documentation that take into account the difficulty to access the station and how to improve the infrastructure to cope with an increase use of the station.	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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	The methodology in the GB Review Study which informs the proposed changes to the GB is questionable	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that the methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and consistently applied in the review. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 10 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has use a range of evidence as set out in Section 8 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper to inform the DPD. They collectively justify the allocation of the proposed sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Queries the process of releasing land. WBC are releasing land and considering the consequences (inefficient infrastructure, flooding problems, overcrowding, loss of biodiversity, lack of facilities) later. WBC should consider the suitability of the land in line with national policy first. It should provide landscape, environmental, infrastructure assessments etc. before considering the release of GB land for development	None stated.	The Council has carried out various evidence base studies to inform the Site Allocations DPD, including Flood Risk Assessment, Landscape Assessment, Transport Assessment and a Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Green Belt boundary review report. The whole list of evidence base is at Appendix of the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is satisfied based on the evidence that the proposals can be developed without significantly undermining the character of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	Information on the Site Allocations DPD consultation has been a real challenge -A complicated website -Online material is difficult to read -Biased leaflet ("WBC MUST, rather than SHOULD...") -poorly presented public consultations -Unclear displays Requests the existing information and methodology for the	None stated.	The Council will continue to explore opportunities to improve how it communicates its proposals in the future.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				release of the GB be reviewed.			
80	Crista	Rayner	GB9	The Site Allocations Development Plan will have a devastating impact on the Villages surrounded by the Green Belt.	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23, 19.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Object to proposed changes to the GB. The changes will have a major impact on Mayford and the surrounding areas	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	National policy states hat Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" There is no justification for the proposals in the GB in Mayford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Documentation should be provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites and other GB sites have been considered e.g. golf courses by the Town Centre. WBC have only considered sites owned by developers and not necessarily the most appropriate sites (e.g. access to town centre, shops, medical facilities)	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	The GB in Mayford provides a fundamental separation of Woking and Guildford. Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will risk coalescence of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will set a precedence for further development	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs (Special Sites of Scientific Interest) and should have 400m buffers to protect them from encroaching development. Has this been considered?	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 Smarts Heath as SPA, it is not yet designated and this restriction cannot be applied. Nevertheless, the importance of protecting SSSIs are fully acknowledged and there are robust policies to achieve that.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	There is an increased risk on wildlife, or complete loss of wildlife on protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of proposed development, including the increase of traveller pitches	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Ten Acre Farm: over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Why should it be considered now?	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Previously proposals might have been refused permission on the basis of them been contrary to planning policy. The site is now being allocated through the plan making process. National policy allows such an approach through the plan making process.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance and should not be considered for development. Why has it?	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. During wet seasons, the land is saturated with water, providing flood relieve for houses along Saunders Lane. How will surface water be treated? What measures will be put in place if development goes ahead	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Saunders Lane is 1.2mi long, with no public transport, narrow road, few lampposts, missing footpaths, no cycle lane and a one lane rail bridge. There is no study that identifies traffic mitigation/improvement measures to cater for an additional 500 homes and respective vehicles	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Mayford has no supporting infrastructure including shops, medical centres, schools to support the new housing.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	Worplesdon Station is only accessible by vehicle. There are no pedestrian footpaths, is a very narrow road, accessible under/over one lane bridges seen any. There is no documentation that take into account the difficulty to access the station and how to improve the infrastructure to cope with an increase use of the station.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	The methodology in the GB Review Study which informs the proposed changes to the GB is questionable	None stated.	This issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	<p>Queries the process of releasing land.</p> <p>WBC are releasing land and considering the consequences (inefficient infrastructure, flooding problems, overcrowding, loss of biodiversity, lack of facilities) later.</p> <p>WBC should consider the suitability of the land in line with national policy first. It should provide landscape, environmental, infrastructure assessments etc. before considering the release of GB land for development</p>	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The transport and infrastructure studies were carried out first to inform decision about the DPD. 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	<p>Information on the Site Allocations DPD consultation has been a real challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A complicated website -Online material is difficult to read -Biased leaflet (“WBC MUST, rather than SHOULD....”) -poorly presented public consultations -Unclear displays <p>Requests the existing information and methodology for the release of the GB be reviewed.</p>	None stated.	The comment are noted. The Council will continue to find ways to improve its consultation with the public.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB10	The Site Allocations Development Plan will have a devastating impact on the Villages surrounded by the Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need of the area. The evidence demonstrate that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Object to proposed changes to the GB. The changes will have a major impact on Mayford and the surrounding areas	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	<p>National policy states hat Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”</p> <p>There is no justification for the proposals in the GB in Mayford</p>	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	<p>Documentation should be provided to demonstrate all brownfield sites and other GB sites have been considered e.g. golf courses by the Town Centre.</p> <p>WBC have only considered sites owned by developers and not necessarily the most appropriate sites (e.g. access to town centre, shops, medical facilities)</p>	None stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11. Land ownership 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	The GB in Mayford provides a fundamental separation of Woking and Guildford. Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will risk coalescence of Woking and Guildford	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Development of GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 will set a precedence for further 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. It is envisaged that the proposals will ensure the enduring permanence of the Green Belt boundary.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs (Special Sites of Scientific Interest) and should have 400m buffers to protect them from encroaching development. Has this been considered?	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	There is an increased risk on wildlife, or complete loss of wildlife on protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of proposed development, including the increase of traveller pitches	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Ten Acre Farm: over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Why should it be considered now?	None stated.	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance and should not be considered for development. Why has it?	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane is a key area for rainwater absorption to alleviate flooding. During wet seasons, the land is saturated with water, providing flood relieve for houses along Saunders Lane. How will surface water be treated? What measures will be put in place if development goes ahead	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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Saunders Lane is 1.2mi long, with no public transport, narrow road, few lampposts, missing footpaths, no cycle lane and a one lane rail bridge. There is no study that identifies traffic mitigation/improvement measures to cater for an additional 500 homes and respective vehicles	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Mayford has no supporting infrastructure including shops, medical centres, schools to support the new housing.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Worplesdon Station is only accessible by vehicle. There are no pedestrian footpaths, is a very narrow road, accessible under/over one lane bridges seen any. There is no documentation that take into account the difficulty to access the station and how to improve the infrastructure to cope with an increase use of the station.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is 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 need 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The need for improved access to Worplesdon Station has been raised with Network Rail.	
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	The methodology in the GB Review Study which informs the proposed changes to the GB is questionable	None stated.	The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been consistently applied in carrying out the review. This matter has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Queries the process of releasing land. WBC are releasing land and considering the consequences (inefficient infrastructure, flooding problems, overcrowding, loss of biodiversity, lack of facilities) later. WBC should consider the suitability of the land in line with national policy first. It should provide landscape, environmental, infrastructure assessments etc. before considering the release of GB land for development	None stated.	The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). 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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 need 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
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	Information on the Site Allocations DPD consultation has been a real challenge -A complicated website -Online material is difficult to read -Biased leaflet ("WBC MUST, rather than SHOULD...") -poorly presented public consultations -Unclear displays	None stated.	The Council will continue to explore better ways of managing and communicating its information. The methodology for carrying out the Green Belt boundary review is robust and has been applied consistently. This matter has been addressed in detail in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 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
				Requests the existing information and methodology for the release of the GB be reviewed.			
80	Crista	Rayner	GB11	The Site Allocations Development Plan will have a devastating impact on the Villages surrounded by the Green Belt.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The sites can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that based on the evidence the character of the area will be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB7	The information provided during the consultation period is difficult to follow and the evidence base is buried in the website. There are no maps to show how sites have been selected. Planning Officers were able to answer questions at the public consultation events but generally the consultation requires the non-expert public to be able to access complex technical and expert documentation. It is therefore difficult to determine whether due diligence in the selection of sites has taken place.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges that there is a significant amount of documents within its evidence base. This is necessary to ensure that the decisions made are based on robust evidence that can withstand scrutiny at the examination in public. Nevertheless, the Council has put its evidence base online for people to consider. The Council has also prepared Executive Summaries to some of the larger documents including the Green Belt boundary review, Site Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal and the Site Allocations DPD. The Council will note the comments of the representation and consider its approach for future consultation events.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB8	The information provided during the consultation period is difficult to follow and the evidence base is buried in the website. There are no maps to show how sites have been selected. Planning Officers were able to answer questions at the public consultation events but generally the consultation requires the non-expert public to be able to access complex technical and expert documentation. It is therefore difficult to determine whether due diligence in the selection of sites has taken place.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges that there is a significant amount of documents within its evidence base. This is necessary to ensure that the decisions made are based on robust evidence that can withstand scrutiny at the examination in public. Nevertheless, the Council has put its evidence base online for people to consider. The Council has also prepared Executive Summaries to some of the larger documents including the Green Belt boundary review, Site Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal and the Site Allocations DPD. The Council will note the comments of the representation and consider its approach for future consultation events.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB9	The information provided during the consultation period is difficult to follow and the evidence base is buried in the website. There are no maps to show how sites have been selected. Planning Officers were able to answer questions at the public consultation events but generally the consultation requires the non-expert public to be able to access complex technical and expert documentation. It is therefore difficult to determine whether due diligence in the selection of sites has taken place.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges that there is a significant amount of documents within its evidence base. This is necessary to ensure that the decisions made are based on robust evidence that can withstand scrutiny at the examination in public. Nevertheless, the Council has put its evidence base online for people to consider. The Council has also prepared Executive Summaries to some of the larger documents including the Green Belt boundary review, Site Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal and the Site Allocations DPD. The Council will note the comments of the representation and consider its approach for future consultation events.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB10	The information provided during the consultation period is difficult to follow and the evidence base is buried in the website. There are no maps to show how sites have been selected. Planning Officers were able to answer questions at the public consultation events but generally the consultation requires the non-expert public to be able to access complex technical and expert documentation. It is therefore difficult to determine whether due diligence in the selection of sites has taken place.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges that there is a significant amount of documents within its evidence base. This is necessary to ensure that the decisions made are based on robust evidence that can withstand scrutiny at the examination in public. Nevertheless, the Council has put its evidence base online for people to consider. The Council has also prepared Executive Summaries to some of the larger documents including the Green Belt boundary review, Site Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal and the Site Allocations DPD. The Council will note the comments of the representation and consider its approach for future consultation events.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB11	The information provided during the consultation period is difficult to follow and the evidence base is buried in the website. There are no maps to show how sites have been selected. Planning Officers were able to answer questions at the public consultation events but generally the consultation requires the non-expert public to be able to access complex technical and expert documentation. It is therefore difficult to determine whether due diligence in the selection of sites has taken place.	None stated.	The Council acknowledges that there is a significant amount of documents within its evidence base. This is necessary to ensure that the decisions made are based on robust evidence that can withstand scrutiny at the examination in public. Nevertheless, the Council has put its evidence base online for people to consider. The Council has also prepared Executive Summaries to some of the larger documents including the Green Belt boundary review, Site Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal and the Site Allocations DPD. The Council will note the comments of the representation and consider its approach for future consultation events.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB7	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The GBBR considered GB7,8,9,10,11 as one parcel (Parcel 20). This ignored boundary defining features such as the railway line.	None stated.	The Council's approach to the Green Belt boundary review and the methodology undertaken has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 10.0. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document the Council has used in identifying sites for development and safeguarding. The full list can be	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Accessibility to services and infrastructure was based on the area of land nearest to it, rather than the actual times for all of the individual sites within the parcel. This is inconsistent and GB11 is identified as having very low suitability for removal from Green Belt. Other parcels assessed score better in this category. It is not clear why parcel 20 has been selected over other parcels and sites. This means that substantial areas with development potential and less adverse impact on the Green Belt as identified in the GBR have not been fully considered in the SHLAA. WBC have only applied its sustainability assessment (covering 18 criteria) to sites in the SHLAA and not all the identified areas in the GBR. This approach has significantly skewed the land assessment process with sites not being considered on a like for like basis.		found in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD and includes the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which considered around 125 sites in total. This has been fully set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0 and Section 9.0.	
839	James	Rayner	GB8	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The GBBR considered GB7,8,9,10,11 as one parcel (Parcel 20). This ignored boundary defining features such as the railway line. Accessibility to services and infrastructure was based on the area of land nearest to it, rather than the actual times for all of the individual sites within the parcel. This is inconsistent and GB11 is identified as having very low suitability for removal from Green Belt. Other parcels assessed score better in this category. It is not clear why parcel 20 has been selected over other parcels and sites. This means that substantial areas with development potential and less adverse impact on the Green Belt as identified in the GBR have not been fully considered in the SHLAA. WBC have only applied its sustainability assessment (covering 18 criteria) to sites in the SHLAA and not all the identified areas in the GBR. This approach has significantly skewed the land assessment process with sites not being considered on a like for like basis.	None stated.	The Council's approach to the Green Belt boundary review and the methodology undertaken has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 10.0. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document the Council has used in identifying sites for development and safeguarding. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD and includes the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which considered around 125 sites in total. This has been fully set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB9	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The GBBR considered GB7,8,9,10,11 as one parcel (Parcel 20). This ignored boundary defining features such as the railway line. Accessibility to services and infrastructure was based on the area of land nearest to it, rather than the actual times for all of the individual sites within the parcel. This is inconsistent and GB11 is identified as having very low suitability for removal from Green Belt. Other parcels assessed score better in this category. It is not clear why parcel 20 has been selected over other parcels and sites. This means that substantial areas with development potential and less adverse impact on the Green Belt as identified in the GBR have not been fully considered in the SHLAA. WBC have only applied its sustainability assessment (covering 18 criteria) to sites in the SHLAA and not all the identified areas in the GBR. This approach has significantly skewed the land assessment process with sites not being considered on a like for like basis.	None stated.	The Council's approach to the Green Belt boundary review and the methodology undertaken has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 10.0. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document the Council has used in identifying sites for development and safeguarding. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD and includes the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which considered around 125 sites in total. This has been fully set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The GBBR considered GB7,8,9,10,11 as one parcel (Parcel 20). This ignored boundary defining features such as the railway line. Accessibility to services and infrastructure was based on the area of land nearest to it, rather than the actual times for all of the individual sites within the parcel. This is inconsistent	None stated.	The Council's approach to the Green Belt boundary review and the methodology undertaken has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 10.0. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document the Council has used in identifying sites for development and safeguarding. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD and includes the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which considered around 125 sites in total. This has been fully set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and GB11 is identified as having very low suitability for removal from Green Belt. Other parcels assessed score better in this category. It is not clear why parcel 20 has been selected over other parcels and sites. This means that substantial areas with development potential and less adverse impact on the Green Belt as identified in the GBR have not been fully considered in the SHLAA. WBC have only applied its sustainability assessment (covering 18 criteria) to sites in the SHLAA and not all the identified areas in the GBR. This approach has significantly skewed the land assessment process with sites not being considered on a like for like basis.			
839	James	Rayner	GB11	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The GBBR considered GB7,8,9,10,11 as one parcel (Parcel 20). This ignored boundary defining features such as the railway line. Accessibility to services and infrastructure was based on the area of land nearest to it, rather than the actual times for all of the individual sites within the parcel. This is inconsistent and GB11 is identified as having very low suitability for removal from Green Belt. Other parcels assessed score better in this category. It is not clear why parcel 20 has been selected over other parcels and sites. This means that substantial areas with development potential and less adverse impact on the Green Belt as identified in the GBR have not been fully considered in the SHLAA. WBC have only applied its sustainability assessment (covering 18 criteria) to sites in the SHLAA and not all the identified areas in the GBR. This approach has significantly skewed the land assessment process with sites not being considered on a like for like basis.	None stated.	The Council's approach to the Green Belt boundary review and the methodology undertaken has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 10.0. It should be noted that the Green Belt boundary review is just one evidence document the Council has used in identifying sites for development and safeguarding. The full list can be found in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD and includes the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which considered around 125 sites in total. This has been fully set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0 and Section 9.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB7	The proposals will create an indefensible Green Belt boundary. It will then result in a large fringe of urban development extending west that will reduce the value, openness and quality of the remaining Green Belt areas to the north and south. It will therefore increase the likelihood of significant future development. The NPPF is clear that boundaries should be physical features and likely to be permanent. The DPD does not achieve this criteria and should be reconsidered.	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
839	James	Rayner	GB8	The proposals will create an indefensible Green Belt boundary. It will then result in a large fringe of urban development extending west that will reduce the value, openness and quality of the remaining Green Belt areas to the north and south. It will therefore increase the likelihood of significant future development. The NPPF is clear that boundaries should be physical features and likely to be permanent. The DPD does not achieve this criteria and should be reconsidered.	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
839	James	Rayner	GB9	The proposals will create an indefensible Green Belt boundary. It will then result in a large fringe of urban development extending west that will reduce the value, openness and quality of the remaining Green Belt areas to the north and south. It will therefore increase the likelihood of significant future development. The NPPF is clear that	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				boundaries should be physical features and likely to be permanent. The DPD does not achieve this criteria and should be reconsidered.		<p>there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB10	The proposals will create an indefensible Green Belt boundary. It will then result in a large fringe of urban development extending west that will reduce the value, openness and quality of the remaining Green Belt areas to the north and south. It will therefore increase the likelihood of significant future development. The NPPF is clear that boundaries should be physical features and likely to be permanent. The DPD does not achieve this criteria and should be reconsidered.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB11	The proposals will create an indefensible Green Belt boundary. It will then result in a large fringe of urban development extending west that will reduce the value, openness and quality of the remaining Green Belt areas to the north and south. It will therefore increase the likelihood of significant future development. The NPPF is clear that boundaries should be physical features and likely to be permanent. The DPD does not achieve this criteria and should be reconsidered.	None stated.	<p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB7	The sites are highly separated in terms of accessibility and have no major access points. The local road network is limited by narrow road and railway bridge widths. These have not been considered. The Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment January 2015 highlights that these sites will have significant impacts on the local road network and junctions. There is no public transport, footpaths or cycle lanes and no measures in place to mitigate the impact of any future development. This also applies to the increased use of the station and access to it.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and cycle paths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure 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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations. The Council is committed to working with Network Rail and the train operator to address capacity issues as well as station facilities to make sure that development does not have an adverse impact on the rail network.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB8	<p>The sites are highly separated in terms of accessibility and have no major access points. The local road network is limited by narrow road and railway bridge widths. These have not been considered. The Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment January 2015 highlights that these sites will have significant impacts on the local road network and junctions. There is no public transport, footpaths or cycle lanes and no measures in place to mitigate the impact of any future development. This also applies to the increased use of the station and access to it.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and cycle paths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations. The Council is committed to working with Network Rail and the train operator to address capacity issues as well as station facilities to make sure that development does not have an adverse impact on the rail network.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB9	<p>The sites are highly separated in terms of accessibility and have no major access points. The local road network is limited by narrow road and railway bridge widths. These have not been considered. The Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment January 2015 highlights that these sites will have significant impacts on the local road network and junctions. There is no public transport, footpaths or cycle lanes and no measures in place to mitigate the impact of any future development. This also applies to the increased use of the station and access to it.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and cycle paths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations. The Council is committed to working with Network Rail and the train operator to address capacity issues as well as station facilities to make sure that development does not have an adverse impact on the rail network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
839	James	Rayner	GB10	The sites are highly separated in terms of accessibility and have no major access points. The local road network is limited by narrow road and railway bridge widths. These have not been considered. The Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment January 2015 highlights that these sites will have significant impacts on the local road network and junctions. There is no public transport, footpaths or cycle lanes and no measures in place to mitigate the impact of any future development. This also applies to the increased use of the station and access to it.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and cycle paths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations. The Council is committed to working with Network Rail and the train operator to address capacity issues as well as station facilities to make sure that development does not have an adverse impact on the rail network.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB11	The sites are highly separated in terms of accessibility and have no major access points. The local road network is limited by narrow road and railway bridge widths. These have not been considered. The Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test Strategic Transport Assessment January 2015 highlights that these sites will have significant impacts on the local road network and junctions. There is no public transport, footpaths or cycle lanes and no measures in place to mitigate the impact of any future development. This also applies to the increased use of the station and access to it.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding pedestrian footpaths and cycle paths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes 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 existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p> <p>South West Trains has already identified that car parking provision at Brookwood Station is not adequate to meet demand and is proposing to increase capacity. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail and the train operator to address the facilities at all of the boroughs railway stations. The Council is committed to working with Network Rail and the train operator to address capacity issues as well as station facilities to make sure that development does not have an adverse impact on the rail network.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB7	<p>Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites. Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. The increase in Travellers pitches will also affect these sites. Further development at Ten Acre Farm has been resisted in the past as it reduces the openness of the Green Belt, why has this changed now? Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.</p>	None stated.	<p>Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The 400m exclusion zone could not therefore apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p> <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 ground. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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>Section 9 of the NPPF deals with the protection of Green Belt land. Paragraph 83 states that once established, Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the local plan. The use of the Site Allocations process to identify sites to meet the need of Travellers is therefore in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and the Core Strategy. It is the Council's view that the development of sites allocated through the plan-led process in a local plan where the principle had been established will not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt if care had been taken to minimise any adverse impacts of the development and it had been demonstrated that no urban sites could be identified to meet the need.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation relating to flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB8	<p>Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites. Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. The increase in Travellers pitches will also affect these sites. Further development at Ten Acre Farm has been resisted in the past as it reduces the openness of the Green Belt, why has this changed now? Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.</p>	None stated.	<p>Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The 400m exclusion zone could not therefore apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p> <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 ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>Section 9 of the NPPF deals with the protection of Green Belt land. Paragraph 83 states that once established, Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the local plan. The use of the Site Allocations process to identify sites to meet the need of Travellers is therefore in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and the Core Strategy. It is the Council's view that the development of sites allocated through the plan-led process in a local plan where the principle had been established will not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt if care had been taken to minimise any adverse impacts of the development and it had been demonstrated that no urban sites could be identified to meet the 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
						<p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation relating to flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB9	<p>Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites. Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. The increase in Travellers pitches will also affect these sites. Further development at Ten Acre Farm has been resisted in the past as it reduces the openness of the Green Belt, why has this changed now? Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.</p>	None stated.	<p>Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The 400m exclusion zone could not therefore apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p> <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 ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>Section 9 of the NPPF deals with the protection of Green Belt land. Paragraph 83 states that once established, Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the local plan. The use of the Site Allocations process to identify sites to meet the need of Travellers is therefore in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and the Core Strategy. It is the Council's view that the development of sites allocated through the plan-led process in a local plan where the principle had been established will not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt if care had been taken to minimise any adverse impacts of the development and it had been demonstrated that no urban sites could be identified to meet the need.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation relating to 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
839	James	Rayner	GB10	<p>Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites. Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. The increase in Travellers pitches will also affect these sites. Further development at Ten Acre Farm has been resisted in the past as it reduces the openness of the Green Belt, why has this changed now? Land North of</p>	None stated.	<p>Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The 400m exclusion zone could not therefore apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p> <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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.		<p>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 ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>Section 9 of the NPPF deals with the protection of Green Belt land. Paragraph 83 states that once established, Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the local plan. The use of the Site Allocations process to identify sites to meet the need of Travellers is therefore in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and the Core Strategy. It is the Council's view that the development of sites allocated through the plan-led process in a local plan where the principle had been established will not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt if care had been taken to minimise any adverse impacts of the development and it had been demonstrated that no urban sites could be identified to meet the need.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation relating to flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB11	Prey and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and should have a 400m buffer zone around them like the TBH SPA sites. Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development. The increase in Travellers pitches will also affect these sites. Further development at Ten Acre Farm has been resisted in the past as it reduces the openness of the Green Belt, why has this changed now? Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore should not be considered for development. 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.	<p>Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are not designated SPAs, and as such they could not be accorded the same status with the same policy justification for their protection. The 400m exclusion zone could not therefore apply in this situation. Nevertheless, the ecological significance of the land will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on their ecological integrity.</p> <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 ground. 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
						<p>account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>Section 9 of the NPPF deals with the protection of Green Belt land. Paragraph 83 states that once established, Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the local plan. The use of the Site Allocations process to identify sites to meet the need of Travellers is therefore in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and the Core Strategy. It is the Council's view that the development of sites allocated through the plan-led process in a local plan where the principle had been established will not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt if care had been taken to minimise any adverse impacts of the development and it had been demonstrated that no urban sites could be identified to meet the need.</p> <p>The Hook Heath Escarpment was taken into account during the preparation of the Green Belt boundary review and the Site Allocations DPD. As noted in the Green Belt boundary review as well as the Key Requirements within the Site Allocations DPD, through careful masterplanning/design layout, it is possible to develop certain areas of the site without compromising the integrity of the escarpment. This would be taken into consideration during any future detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The representation relating to flooding has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	General	Objects to proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary and identification of sites for Safeguarding. These changes will have a major impact on Mayford and the surrounding area.	None stated.	<p>The Council's response to the identification of sites for Safeguarding is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p> <p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB7	Recommend that a new SHMA is carried out with adjacent boroughs to determine housing need and land availability. The SHLAA methodology should be reviewed and updated to provide a broader range of sites and a reassessment of the safeguarded sites, carried out alongside an independent Green Belt Review. A detailed review and viability assessment is undertaken of larger scale strategic urban regeneration adjacent to stations, in particular between Woking and West Byfleet. This will determine whether a high density transit orientated community is achievable within walkable distances of stations and district centres. Sites GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The SHMA has recently been updated and the methodology is clearly set out within the document, which is available for viewing on the Council's website. The approach taken is both consistent with previous studies and national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The SHLAA methodology is also set out on the Council's website. Again this is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review was undertaken by an independent consultant and the Council do not believe that another review would provide alternative recommendations. The Council's approach to safeguarding is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p> <p>The Council notes the suggestion to consider alternative sites. As set out in Section 9.0 and 11.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has considered a significant number of alternative sites in the Borough to meet local housing need. Based on the evidence set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believe the proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives and that its approach is consistent with national planning policy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB8	Recommend that a new SHMA is carried out with adjacent boroughs to determine housing need and land availability. The SHLAA methodology should be reviewed and updated to provide a broader range of sites and a reassessment of the safeguarded sites, carried out alongside an independent Green Belt Review. A detailed review and viability assessment is undertaken of larger scale strategic urban regeneration adjacent to stations, in particular between Woking and West Byfleet. This will determine whether a high density transit orientated community is achievable within walkable distances of stations and district centres. Sites GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The SHMA has recently been updated and the methodology is clearly set out within the document, which is available for viewing on the Council's website. The approach taken is both consistent with previous studies and national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The SHLAA methodology is also set out on the Council's website. Again this is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review was undertaken by an independent consultant and the Council do not believe that another review would provide alternative recommendations. The Council's approach to safeguarding is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p> <p>The Council notes the suggestion to consider alternative sites. As set out in Section 9.0 and 11.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has considered a significant number of alternative sites in the Borough to meet local housing need. Based on the evidence set out</p>	No further modification is 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 Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believe the proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives and that its approach is consistent with national planning policy.	
839	James	Rayner	GB9	Recommend that a new SHMA is carried out with adjacent boroughs to determine housing need and land availability. The SHLAA methodology should be reviewed and updated to provide a broader range of sites and a reassessment of the safeguarded sites, carried out alongside an independent Green Belt Review. A detailed review and viability assessment is undertaken of larger scale strategic urban regeneration adjacent to stations, in particular between Woking and West Byfleet. This will determine whether a high density transit orientated community is achievable within walkable distances of stations and district centres. Sites GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The SHMA has recently been updated and the methodology is clearly set out within the document, which is available for viewing on the Council's website. The approach taken is both consistent with previous studies and national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The SHLAA methodology is also set out on the Council's website. Again this is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review was undertaken by an independent consultant and the Council do not believe that another review would provide alternative recommendations. The Council's approach to safeguarding is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p> <p>The Council notes the suggestion to consider alternative sites. As set out in Section 9.0 and 11.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has considered a significant number of alternative sites in the Borough to meet local housing need. Based on the evidence set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believe the proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives and that its approach is consistent with national planning policy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB10	Recommend that a new SHMA is carried out with adjacent boroughs to determine housing need and land availability. The SHLAA methodology should be reviewed and updated to provide a broader range of sites and a reassessment of the safeguarded sites, carried out alongside an independent Green Belt Review. A detailed review and viability assessment is undertaken of larger scale strategic urban regeneration adjacent to stations, in particular between Woking and West Byfleet. This will determine whether a high density transit orientated community is achievable within walkable distances of stations and district centres. Sites GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The SHMA has recently been updated and the methodology is clearly set out within the document, which is available for viewing on the Council's website. The approach taken is both consistent with previous studies and national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The SHLAA methodology is also set out on the Council's website. Again this is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review was undertaken by an independent consultant and the Council do not believe that another review would provide alternative recommendations. The Council's approach to safeguarding is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p> <p>The Council notes the suggestion to consider alternative sites. As set out in Section 9.0 and 11.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has considered a significant number of alternative sites in the Borough to meet local housing need. Based on the evidence set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believe the proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives and that its approach is consistent with national planning policy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB11	Recommend that a new SHMA is carried out with adjacent boroughs to determine housing need and land availability. The SHLAA methodology should be reviewed and updated to provide a broader range of sites and a reassessment of the safeguarded sites, carried out alongside an independent Green Belt Review. A detailed review and viability assessment is undertaken of larger scale strategic urban regeneration adjacent to stations, in particular between Woking and West Byfleet. This will determine whether a high density transit orientated community is achievable within walkable distances of stations and district centres. Sites GB10 and GB11 should be removed from the DPD.	None stated.	<p>The SHMA has recently been updated and the methodology is clearly set out within the document, which is available for viewing on the Council's website. The approach taken is both consistent with previous studies and national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The SHLAA methodology is also set out on the Council's website. Again this is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review was undertaken by an independent consultant and the Council do not believe that another review would provide alternative recommendations. The Council's approach to safeguarding is set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p> <p>The Council notes the suggestion to consider alternative sites. As set out in Section 9.0 and 11.0. of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Council has considered a significant number of alternative sites in the Borough to meet local housing need. Based on the evidence set out in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations DPD, the Council believe the proposed sites are the most sustainable when compared to all reasonable alternatives and that its approach is consistent with national planning policy.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB7	The NPPF is clear setting out how to determine and assess housing land availability. The 2009 SHLAA, although supported at the time, is now out of date. The updated SHLAA does not take into account national policy and guidance in terms of approach and range of sites to be considered. The SHMA 2014 considers West Surrey to be Woking, Guildford and Waverley and does not take into account other adjacent authorities that have a direct relationship with Woking. The SHLAA does not identify all	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0.</p> <p>As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS6 as well as Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination agreed with the Council's findings that only about 13 years of housing supply could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. The most recent update to the SHLAA has not identified any significant sites that will address any shortfall between 2022 and 2027.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Area for Woking Borough includes Guildford and Waverley. This</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				sites and broad locations regardless of the amount of development needed to provide an audit of available land. Plan makers should consider a wide range of sites. Desk top reviews should include proactive work in identifying as wide a range of sites as possible, including broad locations for development. Any site specific constraints should be noted. Plan makers should not simply rely on sites they have been informed about. The 2014 SHLAA has only considered a limited range of sites and not identified as wide a range as possible. The sites identified are predominantly those sites brought to the attention of WBC which provides a skewed outcome and is inconsistent with the GBBR which looked at a wide range of sites.		is based on the predominant geographical area in which people tend to move within. The methodology for defining the Housing Market Area is set out within Section 2.0 of the SHMA (2015). The Council also considered its approach to be consistent with the NPPF regarding the safeguarding of land for future development need post 2027. This has been clearly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.	
839	James	Rayner	GB8	The NPPF is clear setting out how to determine and assess housing land availability. The 2009 SHLAA, although supported at the time, is now out of date. The updated SHLAA does not take into account national policy and guidance in terms of approach and range of sites to be considered. The SHMA 2014 considers West Surrey to be Woking, Guildford and Waverley and does not take into account other adjacent authorities that have a direct relationship with Woking. The SHLAA does not identify all sites and broad locations regardless of the amount of development needed to provide an audit of available land. Plan makers should consider a wide range of sites. Desk top reviews should include proactive work in identifying as wide a range of sites as possible, including broad locations for development. Any site specific constraints should be noted. Plan makers should not simply rely on sites they have been informed about. The 2014 SHLAA has only considered a limited range of sites and not identified as wide a range as possible. The sites identified are predominantly those sites brought to the attention of WBC which provides a skewed outcome and is inconsistent with the GBBR which looked at a wide range of sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0. As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS6 as well as Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination agreed with the Council's findings that only about 13 years of housing supply could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. The most recent update to the SHLAA has not identified any significant sites that will address any shortfall between 2022 and 2027. The Strategic Housing Market Area for Woking Borough includes Guildford and Waverley. This is based on the predominant geographical area in which people tend to move within. The methodology for defining the Housing Market Area is set out within Section 2.0 of the SHMA (2015). The Council also considered its approach to be consistent with the NPPF regarding the safeguarding of land for future development need post 2027. This has been clearly 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
839	James	Rayner	GB9	The NPPF is clear setting out how to determine and assess housing land availability. The 2009 SHLAA, although supported at the time, is now out of date. The updated SHLAA does not take into account national policy and guidance in terms of approach and range of sites to be considered. The SHMA 2014 considers West Surrey to be Woking, Guildford and Waverley and does not take into account other adjacent authorities that have a direct relationship with Woking. The SHLAA does not identify all sites and broad locations regardless of the amount of development needed to provide an audit of available land. Plan makers should consider a wide range of sites. Desk top reviews should include proactive work in identifying as wide a range of sites as possible, including broad locations for development. Any site specific constraints should be noted. Plan makers should not simply rely on sites they have been informed about. The 2014 SHLAA has only considered a limited range of sites and not identified as wide a range as possible. The sites identified are predominantly those sites brought to the attention of WBC which provides a skewed outcome and is inconsistent with the GBBR which looked at a wide range of sites.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0. As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS6 as well as Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination agreed with the Council's findings that only about 13 years of housing supply could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. The most recent update to the SHLAA has not identified any significant sites that will address any shortfall between 2022 and 2027. The Strategic Housing Market Area for Woking Borough includes Guildford and Waverley. This is based on the predominant geographical area in which people tend to move within. The methodology for defining the Housing Market Area is set out within Section 2.0 of the SHMA (2015). The Council also considered its approach to be consistent with the NPPF regarding the safeguarding of land for future development need post 2027. This has been clearly 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
839	James	Rayner	GB10	The NPPF is clear setting out how to determine and assess housing land availability. The 2009 SHLAA, although supported at the time, is now out of date. The updated	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0. As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS6 as well as Section 1.0 of the Council's 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
				SHLAA does not take into account national policy and guidance in terms of approach and range of sites to be considered. The SHMA 2014 considers West Surrey to be Woking, Guildford and Waverley and does not take into account other adjacent authorities that have a direct relationship with Woking. The SHLAA does not identify all sites and broad locations regardless of the amount of development needed to provide an audit of available land. Plan makers should consider a wide range of sites. Desk top reviews should include proactive work in identifying as wide a range of sites as possible, including broad locations for development. Any site specific constraints should be noted. Plan makers should not simply rely on sites they have been informed about. The 2014 SHLAA has only considered a limited range of sites and not identified as wide a range as possible. The sites identified are predominantly those sites brought to the attention of WBC which provides a skewed outcome and is inconsistent with the GBBR which looked at a wide range of sites.		<p>Matters Topic Paper, the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination agreed with the Council's findings that only about 13 years of housing supply could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. The most recent update to the SHLAA has not identified any significant sites that will address any shortfall between 2022 and 2027.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Area for Woking Borough includes Guildford and Waverley. This is based on the predominant geographical area in which people tend to move within. The methodology for defining the Housing Market Area is set out within Section 2.0 of the SHMA (2015).</p> <p>The Council also considered its approach to be consistent with the NPPF regarding the safeguarding of land for future development need post 2027. This has been clearly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p>	
839	James	Rayner	GB11	The NPPF is clear setting out how to determine and assess housing land availability. The 2009 SHLAA, although supported at the time, is now out of date. The updated SHLAA does not take into account national policy and guidance in terms of approach and range of sites to be considered. The SHMA 2014 considers West Surrey to be Woking, Guildford and Waverley and does not take into account other adjacent authorities that have a direct relationship with Woking. The SHLAA does not identify all sites and broad locations regardless of the amount of development needed to provide an audit of available land. Plan makers should consider a wide range of sites. Desk top reviews should include proactive work in identifying as wide a range of sites as possible, including broad locations for development. Any site specific constraints should be noted. Plan makers should not simply rely on sites they have been informed about. The 2014 SHLAA has only considered a limited range of sites and not identified as wide a range as possible. The sites identified are predominantly those sites brought to the attention of WBC which provides a skewed outcome and is inconsistent with the GBBR which looked at a wide range of sites.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 8.0.</p> <p>As set out in Core Strategy Policy CS6 as well as Section 1.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination agreed with the Council's findings that only about 13 years of housing supply could be identified in the urban area to meet housing need. The most recent update to the SHLAA has not identified any significant sites that will address any shortfall between 2022 and 2027.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Area for Woking Borough includes Guildford and Waverley. This is based on the predominant geographical area in which people tend to move within. The methodology for defining the Housing Market Area is set out within Section 2.0 of the SHMA (2015).</p> <p>The Council also considered its approach to be consistent with the NPPF regarding the safeguarding of land for future development need post 2027. This has been clearly addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
839	James	Rayner	GB7	Strongly object to the sites being developed. The assessment process need further and substantive consideration. The current plans will have a devastating impact on Mayford and south west Woking. It will lead to Mayford and Woking merging with Guildford. 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 regarding the assessment process has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p> <p>In addition to this, the Council representation comment regarding the impact on Mayford and the risk of towns merging together has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</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
839	James	Rayner	GB8	Strongly object to the sites being developed. The assessment process need further and substantive consideration. The current plans will have a devastating impact on Mayford and south west Woking. It will lead to Mayford and Woking merging with Guildford. 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 regarding the assessment process has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p> <p>In addition to this, the Council representation comment regarding the impact on Mayford and the risk of towns merging together has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</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
839	James	Rayner	GB9	Strongly object to the sites being developed. The assessment process need further and substantive consideration. The current plans will have a devastating impact on Mayford and south west Woking. It will lead to Mayford and Woking merging with Guildford. Please also	None stated.	<p>This representation regarding the assessment process has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0.</p> <p>In addition to this, the Council representation comment regarding the impact on Mayford and the risk of towns merging together has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.		Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	
839	James	Rayner	GB10	Strongly object to the sites being developed. The assessment process need further and substantive consideration. The current plans will have a devastating impact on Mayford and south west Woking. It will lead to Mayford and Woking merging with Guildford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation regarding the assessment process has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0. In addition to this, the Council representation comment regarding the impact on Mayford and the risk of towns merging together has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. 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
839	James	Rayner	GB11	Strongly object to the sites being developed. The assessment process need further and substantive consideration. The current plans will have a devastating impact on Mayford and south west Woking. It will lead to Mayford and Woking merging with Guildford. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation regarding the assessment process has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0. In addition to this, the Council representation comment regarding the impact on Mayford and the risk of towns merging together has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0. 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB7	As Mayford already provides a major contribution to the Traveller Community and Ten Acre Farm, urban sites should be considered before the Green Belt. There is no justification for further expansion in the small village of Mayford, which does to have the jobs, shops, services and infrastructure to support the proposal.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 9.0, paragraphs 9.1-9.3 and Section 22.0, paragraph 22.1. With regard to proximity to shops, services and infrastructure, 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 need 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 need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB8	Concerned about the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly in relation to traffic on already congested road at peak hours. Many road do not have pavements or streetlights. 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 the lack of pedestrian footpaths and streetlights to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB9	Concerned about the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly in relation to traffic on already congested road at peak hours. Many road do not have pavements or streetlights. 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 the lack of pedestrian footpaths and streetlights to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB10	Concerned about the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly in relation to traffic on already congested road at peak hours. Many road do not have pavements or streetlights. 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 the lack of pedestrian footpaths and streetlights to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB11	Concerned about the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly in relation to traffic on already congested road at peak hours. Many road do not have pavements or streetlights. 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 the lack of pedestrian footpaths and streetlights to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Concerned about the impact on Mayford's infrastructure, particularly in relation to traffic on already congested road at peak hours. Many road do not have pavements or streetlights. 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 the lack of pedestrian footpaths and streetlights to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB7	Objects to the proposal as does not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB8	Objects to the proposal as does not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced. Mayford should be kept separate from Woking and Guildford and Green Belt is fundamental to preserving this separateness, and retaining the village's character.	None stated.	The representation regarding the openness of the Green Belt and the impact of the proposed allocations on landscape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.2 to 7.4. The representation regarding the separation of Mayford with Woking and Guildford and retaining the character of the village has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB9	Objects to the proposal as does not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced. Mayford should be kept separate from Woking and Guildford and Green Belt is fundamental to preserving this separateness, and retaining the village's character.	None stated.	The representation regarding the openness of the Green Belt and the impact of the proposed allocations on landscape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.2 to 7.4. The representation regarding the separation of Mayford with Woking and Guildford and retaining the character of the village has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB10	Objects to the proposal as does not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced. Mayford should be kept separate from Woking and Guildford and Green Belt is fundamental to preserving this separateness, and retaining the village's character.	None stated.	The representation regarding the openness of the Green Belt and the impact of the proposed allocations on landscape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.2 to 7.4. The representation regarding the separation of Mayford with Woking and Guildford and retaining the character of the village has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB11	Objects to the proposal as does not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced. Mayford should be kept separate from Woking and Guildford and Green Belt is fundamental to preserving this separateness, and retaining the village's character.	None stated.	The representation regarding the openness of the Green Belt and the impact of the proposed allocations on landscape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.2 to 7.4. The representation regarding the separation of Mayford with Woking and Guildford and retaining the character of the village has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Objects to the proposal as does not want the openness of the Green Belt reduced. Mayford should be kept separate from Woking and Guildford and Green Belt is fundamental to preserving this separateness, and retaining the village's character.	None stated.	The representation regarding the openness of the Green Belt and the impact of the proposed allocations on landscape character has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0, in particular paragraph 7.2 to 7.4. The representation regarding the separation of Mayford with Woking and Guildford and retaining the character of the village has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB8	Outlines the road safety dangers on Egley Road due to speed and volume of traffic and the lack of pedestrian crossings. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road or (single lane) railway bridges.	None stated.	This representation 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB9	Outlines the road safety dangers on Egley Road due to speed and volume of traffic and the lack of pedestrian crossings. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road or (single lane) railway bridges.	None stated.	This representation 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB10	Outlines the road safety dangers on Egley Road due to speed and volume of traffic and the lack of pedestrian crossings. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road or (single lane) railway bridges.	None stated.	This representation 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB11	Outlines the road safety dangers on Egley Road due to speed and volume of traffic and the lack of pedestrian crossings. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road or (single lane) railway bridges.	None stated.	This representation 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Outlines the road safety dangers on Egley Road due to speed and volume of traffic and the lack of pedestrian crossings. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road or (single lane) railway bridges.	None stated.	This representation 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB8	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB9	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB11	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Land North of Saunders Lane includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance" and therefore	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				should not be considered for development.			of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB8	Leave Mayford's Green Belt alone. What is currently planned will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday Book which makes it a historic town for which Green Belt is there is preserve. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB9	Leave Mayford's Green Belt alone. What is currently planned will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday Book which makes it a historic town for which Green Belt is there is preserve. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB10	Leave Mayford's Green Belt alone. What is currently planned will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday Book which makes it a historic town for which Green Belt is there is preserve. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB11	Leave Mayford's Green Belt alone. What is currently planned will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday Book which makes it a historic town for which Green Belt is there is preserve. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Leave Mayford's Green Belt alone. What is currently planned will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a Village. Mayford is mentioned in the Domesday Book which makes it a historic town for which Green Belt is there is preserve. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB8	Mayford will lose healthy open green spaces for recreation and wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out, together with the wildlife corridors linking open spaces.	None stated.	This representation is addressed in Section 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless this site required (as planning permission is already approved, subsequent to the publication of the Regulation 18 consultation draft of this document - ref PLAN/2015/0703) a detailed ecological survey was 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>	
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB9	Mayford will lose healthy open green spaces for recreation and wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out, together with the wildlife corridors linking open spaces.	None stated.	<p>This representation is addressed in Section 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites 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 was 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB10	Mayford will lose healthy open green spaces for recreation and wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out, together with the wildlife corridors linking open spaces.	None stated.	<p>This representation is addressed in Section 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites 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 was a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB11	Mayford will lose healthy open green spaces for recreation and wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out, together with the wildlife corridors linking open spaces.	None stated.	<p>This representation is addressed in Section 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites 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 was 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Mayford will lose healthy open green spaces for recreation and wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out, together with the wildlife corridors linking open spaces.	None stated.	<p>This representation is addressed in Section 21.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites 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 was 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
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB8	Green Belt spaces should be protected as it is better for the environment, in protecting natural grassland, shrubs and trees, and their capacity for rainwater and CO2 absorption.	None stated.	<p>The Council's case for Green Belt development to meet local housing need has been set out in Section 1.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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 need 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 noted within the key requirements for the site, there are a number of biodiversity and landscape requirements that will need to be delivered as part of any proposed development. These include the retention of protected and amenity tress, the provision and access to open space and the creation or retention of existing wildlife features and corridors.</p> <p>The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that new development is of a high environmental standard. This includes Policies CS22 and CS23 of the Core Strategy as well as the Climate Change SPD.</p>	
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB9	Green Belt spaces should be protected as it is better for the environment, in protecting natural grassland, shrubs and trees, and their capacity for rainwater and CO2 absorption.	None stated.	<p>The Council's case for Green Belt development to meet local housing need has been set out in Section 1.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need 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 noted within the key requirements for the site, there are a number of biodiversity and landscape requirements that will need to be delivered as part of any proposed development. These include the retention of protected and amenity tress, the provision and access to open space and the creation or retention of existing wildlife features and corridors.</p> <p>The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that new development is of a high environmental standard. This includes Policies CS22 and CS23 of the Core Strategy as well as the Climate Change SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB10	Green Belt spaces should be protected as it is better for the environment, in protecting natural grassland, shrubs and trees, and their capacity for rainwater and CO2 absorption.	None stated.	<p>The Council's case for Green Belt development to meet local housing need has been set out in Section 1.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need 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 noted within the key requirements for the site, there are a number of biodiversity and landscape requirements that will need to be delivered as part of any proposed development. These include the retention of protected and amenity tress, the provision and access to open space and the creation or retention of existing wildlife features and corridors.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that new development is of a high environmental standard. This includes Policies CS22 and CS23 of the Core Strategy as well as the Climate Change SPD.	
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB11	Green Belt spaces should be protected as it is better for the environment, in protecting natural grassland, shrubs and trees, and their capacity for rainwater and CO2 absorption.	None stated.	<p>The Council's case for Green Belt development to meet local housing need has been set out in Section 1.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need 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 noted within the key requirements for the site, there are a number of biodiversity and landscape requirements that will need to be delivered as part of any proposed development. These include the retention of protected and amenity trees, the provision and access to open space and the creation or retention of existing wildlife features and corridors.</p> <p>The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that new development is of a high environmental standard. This includes Policies CS22 and CS23 of the Core Strategy as well as the Climate Change SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB14	Green Belt spaces should be protected as it is better for the environment, in protecting natural grassland, shrubs and trees, and their capacity for rainwater and CO2 absorption.	None stated.	<p>The Council's case for Green Belt development to meet local housing need has been set out in Section 1.0 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need 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 noted within the key requirements for the site, there are a number of biodiversity and landscape requirements that will need to be delivered as part of any proposed development. These include the retention of protected and amenity trees, the provision and access to open space and the creation or retention of existing wildlife features and corridors.</p> <p>The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to make sure that new development is of a high environmental standard. This includes Policies CS22 and CS23 of the Core Strategy as well as the Climate Change SPD.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
634	Eleanor	Reed	GB7	The sites is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, a SSSI, which we use to walk our dog. Any increase in the present Traveller site would unacceptably decrease the visual amenity and character of the area.	None stated.	<p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB12	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Traffic is gridlocked. Trains are overcrowded.		<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The Council notes the concerns regarding large scale developments. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. The delivery of this housing will help to address the local housing need in the Borough. Overall the Council believes that the social, environmental and economic character of the Borough will not be significantly undermined as a result of the proposed allocations.</p>	of this representation
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB13	The village infrastructure is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. Traffic is gridlocked. Trains are overcrowded.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>It is agreed that peak hour trains are operating at or above capacity. This has been noted within the Network Rail Wessex Route Plan which states that 'Commuter travel in the peaks continues to grow leading to frequent overcrowding with some passengers having to stand on journeys to London from as far away as Andover and Winchester'. Within the same report, Network Rail has published its future investment programme to improve the rail infrastructure in the Borough. This includes a grade separated flyover at Woking Station to increase capacity on the network. This particular infrastructure proposal has included within Site Allocation UA23. Any further rail investment programmes will be used in inform the next review of the Woking Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).</p> <p>The Council notes the concerns regarding large scale developments. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy which facilitates the delivery of 4,964 dwellings over the Plan period. The delivery of this housing will help to address the local housing need in the Borough. Overall the Council believes that the social, environmental and economic character of the Borough will not be significantly undermined as a result of the proposed allocations.</p>	
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB12	Development could devalue existing housing because of pressure on the infrastructure. New development will quickly become unaffordable.	None stated.	Proposals will be required to comply with Core Strategy policy CS12 which sets out affordable housing requirements. It is through development that affordable housing will be delivered	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB13	Development could devalue existing housing because of pressure on the infrastructure. New development will quickly become unaffordable.	None stated.	Proposals will be required to comply with Core Strategy policy CS12 which sets out affordable housing requirements. It is through development that affordable housing will be delivered	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB12	There is already a parking problem in the area on school and Church days therefore development in this area is unwise.	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.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed allocated sites are located within walking and cycling distance of Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre. This should reduce the need to travel by car and the implications this has on parking in the local area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB13	There is already a parking problem in the area on school and Church days therefore development in this area is unwise.	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.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed allocated sites are located within walking and cycling distance of Pyrford Neighbourhood Centre. This should reduce the need to travel by car and the implications this has on parking in the local area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford, will detrimentally affect Pyrford due to the scale of development. The village infrastructure is at capacity and Pyrford School is oversubscribed and further development will make the situation worse.	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 infrastructure 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
872	Kathryn	Reed	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford, will detrimentally affect Pyrford due to the scale of development. The village infrastructure is at capacity and Pyrford School is oversubscribed and further development will make the situation worse.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8.	
885	Christine	Reeves	General	Questions how many young people have been consulted. There is virtually no provision for young people, especially teenagers and early 20s. There are no live music centres or places to hear or play music, which is given the size of Woking is a huge oversight. Pub and club venues are not suitable for this age group. The strategy fails to mention Woking's musical heritage.	Address the omission of musical heritage and lack of live music centres.	The Council has set out its consultation procedures during the Regulation 18 consultation in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. You will note that the Council engaged specifically Woking Youth Council. There are many existing leisure facilities in Woking, including facilities in the Town Centre such as the cinema, the theatre and bowling. In addition Policy CS2, CS17 and CS19 of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect existing facilities and support the provision of additional facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
885	Christine	Reeves	General	The Phoenix Cultural Centre are trying to establish a live music venue/cultural centre in WTC. As they operate out of a vacant retail premises they are constantly under threat of having to move out. The Phoenix Cultural Centre's plans fit very well with the DPD strategy "WTC provides a strong cultural and entertainment..." The Council should help the centre to provide a community hub from a permanent location. Suggests using either the Rat & Parrot premises or the empty YMCA Ypod whilst the centre waits for a development to provide a purpose-built centre.	Establish a suitable location for the Phoenix Cultural Centre in Woking Town Centre. Look at the YMCA Ypod and Rat & Parrot sites as suitable locations.	Policy CS2, CS17 and CS19 of the Core Strategy provides a robust policy framework to secure and protect existing facilities and support the provision of additional facilities.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
885	Christine	Reeves	General	The Peacocks Centre offers a positive contribution to WTC. However the acoustics should be softened in the Food Court due to the amount of hard surfaces.	None stated.	This matter does not relate to the draft Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
885	Christine	Reeves	General	Disagrees with proposals to continue to build tower blocks. Current tower blocks do not fit with or enhance the character of WTC.	None stated.	The Council notes the objection to high density development. The Core Strategy states that most of the development within the Borough over the Plan period will take place in Woking Town Centre. This is set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. This approach has been taken in order to create a mixed use high density town centre which contains or is within close proximity to services and facilities. In addition, high density development within the Town Centre prevents further expansion into the Green Belt as lower density development would require more land to be used. The Council has a robust planning policy framework in place to ensure that future development is of a high standard. This includes the Core Strategy, Development Management Policies DPD and Design SPD, which has a specific Section and guidance on tall buildings. In combination, the Council believe that future development will have a significant positive impact on the town centre.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA28	The estate is difficult to go out of, at gridlock at peak times. More people will significantly increase this pressure. Its road network is small, road very narrow, parking effectively enables just one lane/one way, especially Hawthorn Road. There is no plan to upgrade the road network/infrastructure. The number of buses is going to be reduced, increasing traffic movements.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development need of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development need 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!		
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA29	The estate is difficult to go out of, at gridlock at peak times. More people will significantly increase this pressure. Its road network is small, road very narrow, parking effectively enables just one lane/one way, especially Hawthorn Road. There is no plan to upgrade the road network/infrastructure. The number of buses is going to be reduced, increasing traffic movements.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!	The Council has a responsibility to meet the development need of the area as already justified in the Core Strategy. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet the development need 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. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA29	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (the shop area, garages behind the shop and near Barnsbury school). This could improve the appearance of the estate and the security/quality of life of residents but without over crowding the area. The backlands should be left as they are. Where unused they could be transformed into allotments to increase communication between residents and community feeling.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing	Comments about the need to improve the estate will be pass onto the relevant officers of the Council. The proposed allocations in Barnsbury will also contribute towards improving the area. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!		
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA28	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites have been exhausted.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA28	Local primary and new secondary schools are already fully subscribed. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new school provision. This development will have the same issue. It is already difficult to have doctors appointments. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new provision for surgeries. This development will have the same issue.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the	The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Site Allocations DPD makes provision for the delivery of a secondary school. Since the publication of the draft DPD for Regulation 19 consultation, planning permission has been granted for the school proposal. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
					shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!		
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA29	Local primary and new secondary schools are already fully subscribed. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new school provision. This development will have the same issue. It is already difficult to have doctors appointments. A new estate (Willow Reach) has been built close by, but no new provision for surgeries. This development will have the same issue.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!	The infrastructure provision to serve the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Site Allocations DPD makes provision for the delivery of a secondary school. Since the publication of the draft DPD for Regulation 19 consultation, planning permission has been granted for the school proposal. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA29	Increasing antisocial behaviour in the area; increasing the population and reducing children's play area will not improve quality of life.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown	It is envisage that the proposal will lead to significant improvement 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
					(like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!		
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA28	Increasing antisocial behaviour in the area; increasing the population and reducing children's play area will not improve quality of life.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!	There is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will lead to anti social behaviours in the area. It is expected that any development of the site will be supported by adequate open space and children play areas. Overall, it is envisaged that the proposal will enhance the general environment of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA28	Backlands have wildlife and should be preserved.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!	The Council will ensure that any backland development meets all relevant policies of the Development Plan including the need to protect wildlife. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	UA29	Backlands have wildlife and should be preserved.	Woking Borough Council could improve the estate where it is rundown (like the shop area, the garages behind the shop and the garages nearby Barnsbury school). By demolishing and rebuilding these area (possibly with few more houses/flats). This could improve the appearance of the estate as well as the security/quality	The Council will ensure that any backland development meets all relevant policies of the Development Plan including the need to protect wildlife. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					of life of the residents. But without over crowding the area!		
1194	Cyrille	Reiser	General	The Council should organise community discussion prior to make any crucial decision about the community living. Clear information should be distributed. Making the consultation during the holiday period seems to purposefully avoid significant complaints.	None stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6. Nevertheless, the Council values community involvement and will continue to involve the community in the next stages of the DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
740	Hollie	Render	GB4	Traffic is gridlocked. With a proposed school and 150 houses on Parvis Road, the traffic will be pushed further to the already busy alternative road in the area. A number of local employees believe it is unacceptable. Please reconsider.	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 A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation need 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
740	Hollie	Render	GB5	Traffic is gridlocked. With a proposed school and 150 houses on Parvis Road, the traffic will be pushed further to the already busy alternative road in the area. A number of local employees believe it is unacceptable. Please reconsider.	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 A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation need 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>	
740	Hollie	Render	GB15	Traffic is gridlocked. With a proposed school and 150 houses on Parvis Road, the traffic will be pushed further to the already busy alternative road in the area. A number of local employees believe it is unacceptable. Please reconsider.	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 A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation need 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
740	Hollie	Render	GB16	Traffic is gridlocked. With a proposed school and 150 houses on Parvis Road, the traffic will be pushed further to the already busy alternative road in the area. A number of local employees believe it is unacceptable. Please reconsider.	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation need 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>	
145	Scott	Retallick	UA32	Current master plan does not provide as wide a mix of dwelling types/sizes, does not produce specific housing requirements (residents are either compromised in quality of life or left to their own devices) and was arrived at with no assessment of what Sheerwater need (lack of consultation).	Better PR and Clarification to concerned residents who are being fobbed off with contradictions	This is a matter for the development management process relating to the current application being determined. The Local Planning Authorities will make sure that the proposal is determined in accordance with the policy objectives of the Core Strategy and other Local development Documents for the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
145	Scott	Retallick	UA32	Most of us already have decent homes, some less than 30 years old. The problem is our landlord (WBC) refuses to maintain them to a decent standard. Our local services are currently located in a hub, accessible to all with the most needy housed around them; under current master plan this will be lost. How does the removal of accessible recreation facilities and provision elsewhere contribute to the general health of Sheerwater residents if they have to travel to them? The canal tow path has just been improved at considerable cost and this has had a negative effect as cyclists use it for time trials.	Regeneration if any should only focus on areas of most need and should not have a negative effect on everyone's quality of life as will be the case.	The Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as a Priority Place where priority investment will be targeted to address the pockets of deprivation identified in the area. The proposed allocation UA32 will contribute significantly towards achieving this goal. The strategic policy context for developing the site and consequently for its allocation in the Site Allocations DPD is Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The allocation includes a set of key requirements to ensure the sustainable development of the allocated site. One of the key requirements to be met by any proposal to develop the site is an enhancement of the open space provision in the area. The Local Planning Authority will work closely with the applicant of any scheme that comes forward to make sure that the policy aspirations for the site and the key requirements are reflected in the scheme that comes forward for determination. It is important to highlight that planning application has been submitted for the development of the site through the development management process. The application is yet to be determined. The development of the site will enhance the Local Centre to provide day to day need for local residents. It is envisaged that the development of the site will create and support local jobs. The relocation of the track has freed up land to achieve a comprehensive redevelopment of the area with better connectivity and cohesion.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
145	Scott	Retallick	UA32	Current recreation ground and schools fields designed as soakaway drainage to prevent housing flooding. Development can only promote this and will affect the drainage system. It is not acceptable for WBC to say likely cause of water logging from historic lock gate failure because waterlogging of recreation ground and schools fields occurred before this section of canal was restored, and lock gate failure can only allow water to run down hill to River Wey. Woodham Flight is down stream of Sheerwater, because of the nature of the canal water levels are controlled with by-weirs to prevent flooding.	Better transparency communication and less contradiction.	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
145	Scott	Retallick	UA32	Reduce poverty deprivation Sheerwater is only deprived because WBC put it there,	Changing the buildings without	The Core Strategy identifies Sheerwater as a Priority Place where priority investment will be targeted to address the pockets of deprivation identified in the area. There are multiple causes of deprivation in the area. The Council has recognised that and is targeting resources to address them. The proposed allocation UA32 will contribute significantly towards achieving this	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				neglecting it and using it as a dumping ground for antisocial behaviour and benefit claimants, to the detriment of its wider community. WBCs arrogance that tars us all with the same brush to further its own goals is unacceptable.	changing the policy will not solve the problem. The solutions should be obvious.	goal. The strategic policy context for developing the site and consequently for its allocation in the Site Allocations DPD is Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy. The allocation includes a set of key requirements to ensure the sustainable development of the allocated site. One of the key requirements to be met by any proposal to develop the site is an enhancement of the open space provision in the area. The Local Planning Authority will work closely with the applicant of any scheme that comes forward to make sure that the policy aspirations for the site and the key requirements are reflected in the scheme that comes forward for determination. It is important to highlight that planning application has been submitted for the development of the site through the development management process. The application is yet to be determined. The development of the site will enhance the Local Centre to provide day to day need for local residents. It is envisaged that the development of the site will create and support local jobs.	
145	Scott	Retallick	UA32	No evidence of encouraging reuse of existing buildings, although some housing less than 30 years old. Regeneration makes no use of existing buildings within the red-line (where the newest properties are) and it is probable that the area marked 'wider regeneration' will fall under same axe.	I would support re-use of existing buildings if regeneration allowed it, as it doesn't it contradicts, therefore better communication all round.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11 and 1. Most of the proposals in the DPD is about reusing existing building stock in the urban area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
145	Scott	Retallick	UA32	No regeneration/redevelopment can achieve this whilst a continuing attitude from the top down is that of 'hit the easiest target' is the consumer. Need to start with crack down on manufacturers producing high cost, low quality, short shelf life products with excessive or inappropriate packaging and making manufacturers more responsible for disposal. Unacceptable to hit consumers with this problem as we have no choice particularly with essential items. Unacceptable to complain about the cost of fly tipping, this would not happen if a more responsible attitude was taken to disposal (charges were not levied).	This is a problem that is being tackled from the wrong end. And as usual it is we the consumer who suffers from others incompetence/inability to see past £££	Comment noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
145	Scott	Retallick	UA32	Need to resolve issue of WBC and NVHs attitude that 'everything is done by email'. They feel they have the right to shirk other legal obligation to keep residents informed on consultations that affect them in order to guarantee low response. Not everyone has email or access to it, not acceptable to expect us to go online to do their jobs for them. Nor should consultation only be available to those who have email access. How are we supposed to engage with organizations who refuse to engage with us. Only through the efforts of residents association that I was made aware of any consultation.	None stated.	Sheerwater has been identified in the Core Strategy as a Priority Place for targeted action. The proposed allocation and the key requirements it seeks to achieve will lead to significant improvements in the area. Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy sets out clear objectives for the regeneration of the area, with an explanation of the underlying issues that need to be addressed in the area. Many of the issues are reflected in the key requirements of the proposal. Detailed matters such as the nature and type of housing, design, land acquisition will be addressed at part of the development management process. It is noted that in parallel with the plan making process, there is also a planning application on the site that is being determined. The Local Planning Authority to make sure that the application is determined in accordance with Policy CS5 and other relevant policies of the Local Plan. The consultation for the DPD is separate from that of the planning application. Regarding the DPD, there has been extensive public consultation including a visit to Sheerwater to distribute leaflets and speak to people in public. The general approach to consultation is set out in detail in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
409	Natalie	Reynolds	GB15	The GB must be preserved. Development will place a strain on local road infrastructure and local amenities. There are other sites in Woking that would be more suitable	Consider other suitable sites in Woking	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 3.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
409	Natalie	Reynolds	GB16	The GB must be preserved. Development will place a strain on local road infrastructure and local amenities. There are other GB sites in Woking that would be more suitable	Other GB sites are more suitable	With respect to the identification of the site, the representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 9.0. The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0 The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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>	
1394	Celia	Rhodes	GB12	The sites are unsuitable for development due to the lack of main local infrastructure in Pyrford, apart from two schools and a few shops. Main facilities (banks, library, health centre) are in West Byfleet. The schools and health centre are already working to capacity and would not be able to cope.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1394	Celia	Rhodes	GB13	The sites are unsuitable for development due to the lack of main local infrastructure in Pyrford, apart from two schools and a few shops. Main facilities (banks, library, health centre) are in West Byfleet. The schools and health centre are already working to capacity and would not be able to cope.	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. In addition, on health services the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1394	Celia	Rhodes	GB12	Upshot Lane, with no footpath, is very narrow and would not be able to support more cars.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1394	Celia	Rhodes	GB13	Upshot Lane, with no footpath, is very narrow and would not be able to support more cars.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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 road, 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
541	David	Richardson	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 road, 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
541	David	Richardson	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 road, 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
541	David	Richardson	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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB8	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB9	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB10	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB11	Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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	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.			
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure 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.	
541	David	Richardson	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road are unlit at night and few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked at peak hours, which would be further adversely affected by the new homes being developed at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park, the proposed school at Egley Road and additional traffic from the other proposed development.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	GB8	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for development.	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
541	David	Richardson	GB9	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for development.	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
541	David	Richardson	GB10	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for development.	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
541	David	Richardson	GB11	No independently verified evidence has been produced to show the Council has exhausted all brownfield sites for development.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 10.0 and Section 17.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				constraints, Mayford included. It rejected the Ten Acre site as a Traveller site.			
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or 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
541	David	Richardson	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has no bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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 need 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 need 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 need 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.	stated.		
541	David	Richardson	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 need 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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	GB7	Traveller sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and characteristics sympathetic to the local environment. Due to public use of Smarts Heath Common there is no visual privacy, the proximity of the main railway line means it is unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate noise pollution, and the approved 'lorry route' on the B380 would add to this. There is no footpath of the ten Acre Farm side of the road, so children would have to cross the road to reach a footpath.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable. It is also worth noting that Ten Acre Farm is an existing Traveller site with no reported management or health and safety issues. In following the sequential approach to site selection, after looking for suitable sites in the urban area, the Council will first consider whether legally established sites in the Green Belt have capacity to expand without significant adverse impacts on the environment before new sites in the Green Belt are considered. This approach is in line with the sustainability objectives of the SA Report, the requirements of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the advice in the Green Belt boundary review. The County Highways Authority has raised no highways objection to the proposed development on the site. Nevertheless the Council will highlight the lack of footpaths to the County Council to see if the existing situation can be improved for existing and future residents.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	GB7	Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft DCLG guidance on site management states that residents should be discouraged from working from their residential pitches and not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site. Woking Core Strategy outlines that sites should positively enhance the environment and increase openness. Inclusion of business use would inflict a small scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic and nuisance to residents in the road, and is out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.12. It is not intended that the site should be allocated for a business use. The site is allocated as a Traveller site to meet the accommodation need 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
541	David	Richardson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
541	David	Richardson	GB8	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm 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
541	David	Richardson	GB9	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm 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
541	David	Richardson	GB10	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm 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
541	David	Richardson	GB11	Arguments against development Green Belt sites: - National Policy states Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. These have not been proved by the Council, especially as housing need, including for Travellers, does not justify the harm 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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	GB7	Floating obstructions in the river, in part due to existing camping and other activity on the other side of the river, exacerbates the risk of uncontrolled flooding on the site.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	Ten Acre Farm is a functional established Traveller site with no significant recorded management issues. The Council will continue to work closely with the operators of the site to make sure that it continues to be effectively managed. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the number of Traveller pitches on the site would result in an increase in water pollution to the Hoe Stream. This representation regarding flooding and business activity on the site has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10 and 4.12 respectively.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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'.	stated.		
541	David	Richardson	GB7	The Council has set aside the Green Belt Review's recommendations by selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b in proposing the expansion of the site by up to 12 additional pitches. No independently verified evidence shows the Council has exhausted brownfield sites for Traveller development, nor why sites identified as available and viable in the Green Belt Review have not been included, whilst sites excluded (this site and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye) are the only sites put forward.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
541	David	Richardson	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
541	David	Richardson	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<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 ground. 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
541	David	Richardson	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB12	Proposed development in Pyrford, in conjunction with 2000+ homes on Wisley Airfield, 700+ homes in West Byfleet; how is road/school/healthcare/utilities infrastructure going to cope? Local road are narrow, inevitable increase of traffic will increase danger and accidents. Road already poorly maintained. Commuters will need to get to West Byfleet or Woking stations and bus services are few.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council under the duty to cooperate will work its neighbouring authorities to make sure that development impacts of cross boundary significance are fully addressed.	
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB13	Proposed development in Pyrford, in conjunction with 2000+ homes on Wisley Airfield, 700+ homes in West Byfleet; how is road/school/healthcare/utilities infrastructure going to cope? Local road are narrow, inevitable increase of traffic will increase danger and accidents. Road already poorly maintained. Commuters will need to get to West Byfleet or Woking stations and bus services are few.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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. Under the Duty to Cooperate, the Council is working in partnership with its neighbours to make sure the impacts of development with cross boundary implications are fully assessed and appropriate mitigation put in place to address adverse impacts.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB12	I understand housing stocks need to be replenished but why concentrate in the South East? Already massively overcrowded, evident from the air. Towns and villages need to remain separated with green space or we become one enormous awful metropolis.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The proposals are intended to meet locally identified need.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB13	I understand housing stocks need to be replenished but why concentrate in the South East? Already massively overcrowded, evident from the air. Towns and villages need to remain separated with green space or we become one enormous awful metropolis.	None stated.	The proposals are intended to meet identified local need. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 proposals does not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. The Council has carried out a range of studies to demonstrate that the overall purpose of the Green Belt will not be undermined by the proposal. Consequently, it is not envisaged that the proposals will have significant adverse impacts on the quality of life of people and/or the general character of the area. Details of the range of studies used to inform the DPD is set out in Section 8 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB12	West Byfleet Health Centre is already at capacity.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB13	West Byfleet Health Centre is already at capacity.	None stated.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB13	We have good schools at capacity now. There would be future total gridlock.	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
						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.	
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB12	We have good schools at capacity now. There would be future total gridlock.	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 and 3 respectively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB12	What impact on supply of utilities? Water pressure is awful. More power cuts? Hazardous driving in wet weather, development will reduce absorption.	None stated.	The infrastructure implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1086	Rosemary	Richardson	GB13	What impact on supply of utilities? Water pressure is awful. More power cuts? Hazardous driving in wet weather, development will reduce absorption.	None stated.	The infrastructure implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3. Flooding issues are addressed in Section 5 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change	No further modification is 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 this particular location.	
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 road, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodland – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment. Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB8	Land relating to Special Protection Areas (SPA), including a 400m buffer, was excluded from consideration in the Green Belt Review. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs and designated 'Important Bird Areas' by Bird Life International, so should have buffers applied for the same reason. The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of these areas in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA which, if successful, will result in a 400m development exclusion buffer.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB11	Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.	None stated.	This is fully acknowledged. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see best how they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB8	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB9	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB10	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB11	Mayford has a very poor road network, with narrow road, three single line bridges, most road 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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB8	The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' due to Woking not having a particularly strong historical character. However Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB8	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB9	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of	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
				land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.			
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB10	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB11	The Council openly states that it considers land available for development (e.g. owned by the Council or a Developer) more 'viable' for removal from the Green Belt. Ownership of land has not bearing on whether land should be Green Belt or not.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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	The site should be removed from the DPD for	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
				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 reasons stated.		
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 need 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 need 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 need 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 need 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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 need 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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.			
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community. There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	General	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB8	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB9	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB11	Proposed development in Guildford, specifically the football club at Salt Box Road and 1,000 homes around an expanded Slyfield Industrial Estate has not been disclosed to Woking residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1475	Linda	Richardson	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	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				residents. Traffic movements from this development will lead to significant traffic movements and inevitable gridlock.			
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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 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	No further modification is 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 reasons stated.	and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts.	
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	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
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB7	The site was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987. It was never envisaged that the site would be expanded outside of the current occupier's immediate family. For twelve new pitches meeting the government practice guidance on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, there will be unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness, character and appearance of the area, and the local environment, and will not positively increase the openness of the area, nor the rural street scene.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	<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 ground. 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1475	Linda	Richardson	GB7	The site is adjacent to the main railway line so would require significant acoustic barriers.	The site should be removed from the DPD for the reasons stated.	All of the sites set out in the Site Allocations DPD will require site preparation and ground works to be carried out prior to development taking place. Depending on the recent and historic uses of the site, its location and site constraints, site specific matters such as the need for acoustic barriers, will need to be fully assessed and where necessary, mitigation measures identified to address any adverse impacts. The requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1698	Phil	Riddles	GB12	Development will result in property values falling in the local area. If this happens will WBC offer compensation. Who is the owner of the site and has ownership recently changed?	None stated.	As noted by the National Planning Practice Guidance, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property could not be material considerations. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies that the need (demand) for housing within the Borough far outstrips supply. Therefore it is extremely unlikely that there will be an oversupply of housing in the Borough. The procedure to compensate land owners adjacent to development sites is clearly set out by the Government. The Council do not believe that there are any legal ground to financially compensate adjacent land owners if the proposed allocation is developed post-2027. The existing land owner for the site is set out in the public domain and accessible through Land Registry.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1698	Phil	Riddles	GB13	Development will result in property values falling in the local area. If this happens will WBC offer compensation. Who is the owner of the site and has ownership recently changed?	None stated.	As noted by the National Planning Practice Guidance, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property could not be material considerations. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies that the need (demand) for housing within the Borough far outstrips supply. Therefore it is extremely unlikely that there will be an oversupply of housing in the Borough. The procedure to compensate land owners adjacent to development sites is clearly set out by the Government. The Council do not believe that there are any legal ground to financially compensate adjacent land owners if the proposed allocation is developed post-2027. The existing land owner for the site is set out in the public domain and accessible through Land Registry.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1698	Phil	Riddles	GB12	Why have residents not been informed about the proposals sooner. Hope local views are taken into account.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. The views of the local community are taken into account throughout the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. The Regulation 18 consultation will be followed by another six week consultation (Regulation 19) in 2016. There will also be an opportunity for the community to comment on the DPD during the Public Examination.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1698	Phil	Riddles	GB13	Why have residents not been informed about the proposals sooner. Hope local views are taken into account.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 6.0. The views of the local community are taken into account throughout the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. The Regulation 18 consultation will be followed by another six week consultation (Regulation 19) in 2016. There will also be an opportunity for the community to comment on the DPD during the Public Examination.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1698	Phil	Riddles	GB12	Objects. The GBBR did not recommend GB13. Pyrford is a village and has poor infrastructure. The school is not large enough to cope additional residents.	None stated.	The representation regarding the Green Belt review findings has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0. The representation regarding the village feel of Pyrford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area. The Council has consulted with the relevant emergency service providers and will continue to work with them as part of the plan making process. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed land uses for the draft allocation will result in an increase in crime. However the Core	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Strategy states in CS21: Design that new development should create a safe and secure environment where the opportunities for crime are minimised. At the planning application stage, the Council may also consult with the Police Service (Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDA), Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) and Architectural Liaison Officers (ALO)) to make sure that any potential crime and safety issues are addressed.	
1698	Phil	Riddles	GB13	Objects. The GBBR did not recommend GB13. Pyrford is a village and has poor infrastructure. The school is not large enough to cope additional residents.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the Green Belt review findings has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 17.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the village feel of Pyrford has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.8. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.</p> <p>The Council has consulted with the relevant emergency service providers and will continue to work with them as part of the plan making process. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed land uses for the draft allocation will result in an increase in crime. However the Core Strategy states in CS21: Design that new development should create a safe and secure environment where the opportunities for crime are minimised. At the planning application stage, the Council may also consult with the Police Service (Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDA), Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) and Architectural Liaison Officers (ALO)) to make sure that any potential crime and safety issues are addressed.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1557	Robin, Jean	Ridges	GB4	The Green Belt is well used and should not be spoiled.	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
1557	Robin, Jean	Ridges	GB5	The Green Belt is well used and should not be spoiled.	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
1557	Robin, Jean	Ridges	GB4	Drainage is at capacity and new developments and local road flood in heavy rain.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1557	Robin, Jean	Ridges	GB5	Drainage is at capacity and new developments and local road flood in heavy rain. Byfleet floods and can not cope with more housing.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1557	Robin, Jean	Ridges	GB4	Drainage is at capacity and new developments and local road flood in heavy rain. Byfleet floods and can not cope with more housing.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.10 and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1557	Robin, Jean	Ridges	GB5	There are pressures for parking in Byfleet, whilst road are very busy. More cars will cause gridlock. Do not spoil the friendly nice village anymore.	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 Council has a Parking Standards SPD which sets out specific requirements for parking for new development. The SPD will be applied when development comes forward. In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS18 allows a number of factors to be taken into account in applying the standard, including proximity to public transport and existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development.</p>	
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 ground. 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
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB10	Object to development on the Green Belt. The proposals go against the purposes of the Green Belt to prevent over building and maintain space between places.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB11	Object to development on the Green Belt. The proposals go against the purposes of the Green Belt to prevent over building and maintain space between places.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 12.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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>	No further modification is 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.	
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB9	Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt to create a defensible boundary. The proposed changes would create a weaker boundary due to the removal of the escarpment.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14 there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Guildford, against the purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character.		the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB10	NPPF permits Green Belt release only in exceptional circumstances, the Council haven't proven this for development post 2027. Questions if the new WTC developments have been considered. WBC should be arguing, on behalf of Hook Heath and Mayford residents, the importance of the Green Belt and resisting future development on this land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB11	NPPF permits Green Belt release only in exceptional circumstances, the Council haven't proven this for development post 2027. Questions if the new WTC developments have been considered. WBC should be arguing, on behalf of Hook Heath and Mayford residents, the importance of the Green Belt and resisting future development on this land.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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>	
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB10	National policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This has not been proven by WBC, especially as Policy states that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 4.0, paragraph 4.4	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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.	The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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>	
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p>	
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>traffic 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>	
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB10	<p>The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.</p>	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. 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
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB11	<p>The GBBR states that Mayford is within 7 minutes driving from Woking Town Centre which is incorrect as it takes much longer during peak times. Mayford has a very poor road network and traffic is gridlocked. Additional homes in the local area will make this much worse. There are also very few pedestrian footpaths. Further developments in the local area will increase the traffic issues.</p>	None stated.	<p>The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the journey time estimates used in the Green Belt boundary review. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 17.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 road 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.	This representation 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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 road 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.	This representation 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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 road 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.	This representation 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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 road 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.	This representation 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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB9	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB10	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	GB11	There are three single lane bridges in the area and they will be unable to handle any additional traffic. Additional increase in congestion will also occur at Worplesdon Station.	None stated.	The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
950	Sharon	Rigby	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. 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 need 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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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 need 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 need 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 need of local people.	
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
950	Sharon	Rigby	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
205	John	Rigby-Jones	GB12	also as local infrastructure - road, schools, and shops, etc. - insufficient to meet a great increase in demand. Coldharbour Road is already busy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 County Council has confirmed that the educational need to support the proposed developments in the DPD can be met by a new secondary school and capacity within existing schools.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
205	John	Rigby-Jones	GB13	also as local infrastructure - road, schools, and shops, etc. - insufficient to meet a great increase in demand. Coldharbour Road is already busy.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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	No further modification is 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 is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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.	
205	John	Rigby-Jones	GB12	I object to Green Belt release in Pyrford, not only as this is Green Belt land so should not be built on,	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
205	John	Rigby-Jones	GB13	I object to Green Belt release in Pyrford, not only as this is Green Belt land so should not be built on,	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
205	John	Rigby-Jones	GB13	I appreciate being able to see open spaces, woods, sky, and an amazing view so close to home. Its a special area where town truly meet country. It would be a tragedy to lose this amenity. I do not want to be considered a NIMBY and am not a planner but there is already considerable housing development underway but also other places better suited for development. Ask you to reconsider.	None stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the identified need of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the need over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet need from 2022. This particular issues is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also 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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
205	John	Rigby-Jones	GB12	I appreciate being able to see open spaces, woods, sky, and an amazing view so close to home. Its a special area where town truly meet country. It would be a tragedy to lose this amenity. I do not want to be considered a NIMBY and am not a planner but there is already considerable housing development underway but also other places better suited for development. Ask you to reconsider.	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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. In particular, the Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate the proposals. It is satisfied the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 7 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt to make sure that the proposals do not undermine the overall purpose of the Green Belt. As set out in detail in Sections 19 and 23 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper, the Council's evidence suggests that the character and the heritage assets of the area will not be significantly affected. . The Council has assessed the capacity of brownfield land to meet the identified need of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet the need over the entire plan period. Green Belt land will still be needed to meet need from 2022. This 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
1490	Graham	Ritchie	General	Wokingham Borough Council would welcome the opportunity to work with Woking Borough Council to assess if solutions to the issues identified can be delivered.	None stated.	The Council will consult on these matters as appropriate.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1490	Graham	Ritchie	General	Identification of sufficient land to meet long term development need in Woking will reduce the likelihood that a shortfall would need to be addressed outside that authority, therefore minimising impacts for service delivery in Wokingham Borough.	None stated.	Comment noted. The Council will work with local authorities in the area as part of the Duty to Cooperate and in line with the relevant Planning Regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This is further detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 6.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1490	Graham	Ritchie	General	Advises that Woking Council should consult other minerals planning authorities as they may has similar concerns to Wokingham Borough.	None stated.	The Council will consult on these matters as appropriate.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1490	Graham	Ritchie	General	The report agreed by Wokingham's Executive Member for Planning and Highways. The report raises three main concerns, the first of which is that insufficient land is	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposed for removal from the Green Belt to accommodate long term growth (2027-2040). Woking's approach to reviewing its Green Belt boundaries should adequately address potential need likely to be generated by the south-west Surrey SHMA, which has not been done, to ensure increased housing market pressure is not placed on authorities outside of south-west Surrey's housing market.			
1490	Graham	Ritchie	UA41	Raises concern that allocation of two sites for residential development will prejudice maintenance of the supply of aggregates to meet demand in Surrey, which could negatively impact Wokingham Borough. This site is aggregates rail yard for off-loading and short term storage of aggregates, prior to distribution by road around Surrey. The yard off-load 300,000 tonnes of aggregate annually and its loss will impact the road network, due to the need to transport minerals further by road. The off-loading of 300,000 tonnes of aggregates annually would be equivalent to around 66,400 HGV movements a year, or about 265 movements daily, which could increase HGV movements through Wokingham Borough. The redevelopment of this site should only occur if adequate alternative facilities are provided in Surrey.	The redevelopment of this site should only occur if adequate alternative facilities for aggregate off-loading and storage from the rail network are provided in Surrey.	The Council agrees that this development should only occur if an adequate alternative site can be found to relocate the existing minerals aggregate use to, within the Borough. This is stated as the first key requirement of development, and is a pre-requisite of development of this site. Therefore the draft allocation would not prejudice maintenance of the supply of aggregates to meet demand in Surrey.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1490	Graham	Ritchie	UA15	Raises concern that allocation of two sites for residential development will prejudice maintenance of the supply of aggregates to meet demand in Surrey, which could negatively impact Wokingham Borough. This site is safeguarded for potential extraction site for minerals and is also identified in the County Council's Local Plan as a concrete aggregate safeguarding site. It is essential that the minerals are extracted before redevelopment occurs. This will reduce pressure on Wokingham in meeting Surrey sand and gravel need (Berkshire is a net exporter of sand and gravel to Surrey).	It is essential that the minerals are extracted before redevelopment occurs.	The final key requirement of the draft allocation states that the site is identified as a Concrete Aggregate Safeguarded Site. Surrey County Council, as the Minerals Planning Authority (MPA), would require an accurate assessment of minerals reserves, and if confirmed that minerals reserves are present, it will need to be satisfied that opportunities for working of any significant resource is investigated before any future residential development takes place. Surrey County Council have been consulted prior to the consultation, and also through it. The allocation's reasoned justification states that the MPA will seek to prevent the sterilisation of these resources by other development. It also outlines that a previous assessment for potential mineral zones undertaken in 2004 showed a small quantity of mineral reserves, but that difficulty accessing these reserves would mean extraction would be very unlikely to be viable. However, as stated above and detailed in the draft allocation, the MPA would require an accurate assessment of reserves and be satisfied that any significant resource are fully investigated prior to other development.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB12	The school in West Byfleet could not accommodate pupil numbers.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB13	The school in West Byfleet could not accommodate pupil numbers.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.8	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB12	Apart from Pyrford where will new residents shop?	None stated.	It is for the market to provide shops, however the Council also plans for retail provision with Pyrford serving as a Neighbourhood Centre, to provide for the day to day need of residents in the immediate surrounding area. West Byfleet and Woking, as District and Town centres respectively, are expected to see retail growth over the plan period (as detailed in the Council's Core Strategy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB13	Apart from Pyrford where will new residents shop?	None stated.	It is for the market to provide shops, however the Council also plans for retail provision with Pyrford serving as a Neighbourhood Centre, to provide for the day to day need of residents in the immediate surrounding area. West Byfleet and Woking, as District and Town centres respectively, are expected to see retail growth over the plan period (as detailed in the Council's Core Strategy).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB12	Worried about Pyrford and the proposed development changing it from a small village into an overpopulated area.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB13	Worried about Pyrford and the proposed development changing it from a small village into an overpopulated area.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB12	Feels not enough has been put into this planning proposal. Would like to preserve Pyrford as a very special place for future generations.	None stated.	The proposed allocations have been carefully considered, with the detail outlined in the draft Site Allocations DPD itself and in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 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 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
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB13	Feels not enough has been put into this planning proposal. Would like to preserve Pyrford as a very special place for future generations.	None stated.	The proposed allocations have been carefully considered, with the detail outlined in the draft Site Allocations DPD itself and in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 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 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
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB12	There is insufficient parking in West Byfleet to accommodate additional cars for shopping and for the school.	None stated.	The Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the need of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet. Parking for the school would need to be dealt with in the Broadoaks planning application, as the site is not allocated for a school (but for an employment-led mixed use scheme).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
473	Valerie	Roberts	GB13	There is insufficient parking in West Byfleet to accommodate additional cars for shopping and for the school.	None stated.	The Council sets specific requirements within its Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance, and has a policy framework for car parking (with regard to the locational characteristics of a site) in Core Strategy CS18. The Council's Parking Services Section also works to address specific car parking issues, to ensure there is adequate provision to meet the need of visitors, shoppers, commuters and businesses in West Byfleet. Parking for the school would need to be dealt with in the Broadoaks planning application, as the site is not allocated for a school (but for an employment-led mixed use scheme).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
826	JK	Roberts	GB8	Objects to housing on the site. 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.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB9	Objects to housing on the site. 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.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
826	JK	Roberts	GB10	Objects to housing on the site. 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.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB11	Objects to housing on the site. 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.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB14	Objects to housing on the site. 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.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB7	Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller community. No justification for further expansion in Mayford.	None stated.	By intensifying the use of Ten Acre Farm, the Council accepts that this will lead to an increase in the number of pitches and consequently the population of Travellers in Mayford. The existing site has so far been well managed and there is every indication that it will continue to be well managed when the additional pitches are delivered. Based on the sequential approach, the Council believes that the proposed site allocation relatively offers the most sustainable locations to meet Travellers accommodation need when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
826	JK	Roberts	GB8	Wildlife will be destroyed.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB9	Wildlife will be destroyed.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
826	JK	Roberts	GB10	Wildlife will be destroyed.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB11	Wildlife will be destroyed.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB14	Wildlife will be destroyed.	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>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
826	JK	Roberts	GB8	The government attached great importance to Green Belt. Its fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl. The purposes of Green Belt are set out by national policy.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB9	The government attached great importance to Green Belt. Its fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl. The purposes of Green Belt are set out by national policy.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB10	The government attached great importance to Green Belt. Its fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl. The purposes of Green Belt are set out by national policy.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB11	The government attached great importance to Green Belt. Its fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl. The purposes of Green Belt are set out by national policy.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB14	The government attached great importance to Green Belt. Its fundamental aim is to prevent urban sprawl. The purposes of Green Belt are set out by national policy.	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
826	JK	Roberts	GB8	Flooding is likely to increase if development occurs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
826	JK	Roberts	GB9	Flooding is likely to increase if development occurs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
826	JK	Roberts	GB10	Flooding is likely to increase if development occurs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
826	JK	Roberts	GB11	Flooding is likely to increase if development occurs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
826	JK	Roberts	GB14	Flooding is likely to increase if development occurs.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
826	JK	Roberts	GB8	There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. Green Belt should be protected for future generations and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 23.0 and Section 1.0.</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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	
826	JK	Roberts	GB9	There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. Green Belt should be protected for future generations and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 23.0 and Section 1.0.</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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
826	JK	Roberts	GB10	There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. Green Belt should be protected for future generations and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 23.0 and Section 1.0.</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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
826	JK	Roberts	GB11	There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. Green Belt should be protected for future generations and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 23.0 and Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<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>	
826	JK	Roberts	GB14	There has been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement or retaining its character. Green Belt should be protected for future generations and wildlife.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0, Section 23.0 and Section 1.0.</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>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of 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
826	JK	Roberts	GB8	Traffic between Woking and Guildford is heavy and a new school will make it worse and create gridlock.	None stated.	<p>The key requirements for the allocation note a number of site specific infrastructure improvements that will need to be carried out before the site becomes operational. The proposed school has carried out detailed transport studies in order to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure network. This has been considered appropriate and suitable by the Local Planning Authority as the site has planning permission for a new school and associated leisure facilities.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
976	James	Roberts	GB12	Object to development proposals on the Green Belt. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The road network is at capacity and more homes will make the situation worse.	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 representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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
						<p>to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and safeguarding for future development need has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.</p>	
976	James	Roberts	GB13	<p>Object to development proposals on the Green Belt. Pyrford School is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.</p> <p>The road network is at capacity and more homes will make the situation worse.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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 and safeguarding for future development need has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 2.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1483	Michael	Roberts	GB12	<p>Alarmed and concerned about the proposal, and strongly opposes it. This major development will totally change the character of this very special and exceptional Woking perimeter village.</p>	None stated.	<p>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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1483	Michael	Roberts	GB13	<p>Alarmed and concerned about the proposal, and strongly opposes it. This major development will totally change the character of this very special and exceptional Woking</p>	None stated.	<p>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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				perimeter village.		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.	
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB12	It is sad that people want to do this to a village. Development is understandable but should not be at the expense of existing residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB13	It is sad that people want to do this to a village. Development is understandable but should not be at the expense of existing residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB12	Understand that people require housing but Pyrford is becoming built up and this will have negative impacts. Please consider the proposals very carefully.	None stated.	The Borough's housing need is set out within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of Pyrford has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB13	Understand that people require housing but Pyrford is becoming built up and this will have negative impacts. Please consider the proposals very carefully.	None stated.	The Borough's housing need is set out within the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. The representation regarding the impact of the proposals on the character of Pyrford has been addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network and parking is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The area has changed a lot over recent years and not for the better	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area. it is envisaged that planning to meet housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The road network and parking is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse. The area has changed a lot	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				over recent years and not for the better		<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p> <p>it is envisaged that planning to meet 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>	
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB12	The local area is green and the proposed site is a picture of natural beauty, this should be protected.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB13	The local area is green and the proposed site is a picture of natural beauty, this should be protected.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB12	Speeding is an issue on Coldharbour Road and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
1568	Vivienne	Roberts	GB13	Speeding is an issue on Coldharbour Road and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	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 ground. 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
588	J	Robertson	GB7	Traveller sites are concentrated in Mayford and Brookwood Lye, providing a major contribution to the Traveller community.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	GB8	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
588	J	Robertson	GB9	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	GB10	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	GB11	Objects to the proposal. The housing will fill any green space between Mayford and Woking, turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing the risk of Woking and Guildford merging - the whole purpose of Green Belt. There has been no consideration of preserving Mayford as a separate settlement, nor impact on the character of the village.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 23.0. It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	GB8	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts and Prey Heaths) due to proximity of development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed. Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	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
588	J	Robertson	GB10	Wildlife in developed areas will be wiped out and there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected heaths (Smarts	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or	No further modification is proposed as a result

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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p> <p>The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	
588	J	Robertson	GB11	Please reconsider your plans, which will have a devastating impact on Mayford and Hook Heath. These areas are unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Happy for the Mayford Village Society to represent my views.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p> <p>In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</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
588	J	Robertson	GB8	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	GB9	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	GB10	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
588	J	Robertson	GB11	There has been no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure, particularly the increased strain and traffic on local road. Notes there are no plans to upgrade the road (all single lane) or solutions to deal with existing traffic. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous with increased traffic and people walking on the road (no pavements) to Worplesdon station.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
302	Fred	Robinson	GB4	Parvis Road already suffers from severe congestion. Proposals will make it unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent road. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
302	Fred	Robinson	GB5	Parvis Road already suffers from severe congestion. Proposals will make it unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent road. 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
302	Fred	Robinson	GB4	The sites identified in Byfleet are at risk 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
302	Fred	Robinson	GB5	The sites identified in Byfleet are at risk 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
302	Fred	Robinson	GB4	Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development need 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
302	Fred	Robinson	GB5	Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>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 need up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	
302	Fred	Robinson	GB4	The petition signed by Byfleet residents submitted to the Council 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
302	Fred	Robinson	GB5	The petition signed by Byfleet residents submitted to the Council 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
302	Fred	Robinson	GB4	The current infrastructure provision for education, health, sewerage, road etc is already inadequate and must be rectified before any new development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
302	Fred	Robinson	GB5	The current infrastructure provision for education, health, sewerage, road etc is already inadequate and must be rectified before any new development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
302	Fred	Robinson	GB4	The GB should be preserved, there is other land available	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
302	Fred	Robinson	GB5	The GB should be preserved, there is other land available	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
303	Julie	Robinson	GB4	Parvis Road already suffers from severe congestion. Proposals will make it unusable	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent road. 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
303	Julie	Robinson	GB5	Parvis Road already suffers from severe congestion. Proposals will make it unusable	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent road. 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>	
303	Julie	Robinson	GB4	The sites identified in Byfleet are at risk 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
303	Julie	Robinson	GB5	The sites identified in Byfleet are at risk 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
303	Julie	Robinson	GB4	Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development need 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
303	Julie	Robinson	GB5	Proposals would remove most of local GB but leave the rest of Woking's GB preserved	None stated.	<p>The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough. This could not be achieved because of the uneven distribution of constraints and the need to make sure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations when compared against all other reasonable alternatives. More importantly, the Council has to make sure that any land that is released from the Green Belt does not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. The available evidence suggest that the sites proposed for allocation in Byfleet are in sustainable locations and can be released for development without compromising the purpose of the Green Belt. The Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 18.3% of the existing Green Belt in the ward of Byfleet. Excluding site GB17 which will not be developed and is proposed to be used as publically accessible open space (SANG), the total amount of Green Belt lost for development in Byfleet is 7.3% (10.26ha).</p> <p>Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford, Mayford and Brookwood. This is to meet development need up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
303	Julie	Robinson	GB4	The petition signed by Byfleet residents submitted to the Council 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
303	Julie	Robinson	GB5	The petition signed by Byfleet residents submitted to the Council 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
303	Julie	Robinson	GB4	The current infrastructure provision for education, health, sewerage, road etc is already inadequate and must be rectified before any new development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
303	Julie	Robinson	GB5	The current infrastructure provision for education, health, sewerage, road etc is already inadequate and must be rectified before any new development	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
303	Julie	Robinson	GB4	The GB should be preserved, there is other land available	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
303	Julie	Robinson	GB5	The GB should be preserved, there is other land available	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, Section 11.0, Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2 and Section 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB12	Objects to 400+ new homes on Pyrford's Green Belt despite acknowledging the UK's housing shortage.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB13	Objects to 400+ new homes on Pyrford's Green Belt despite acknowledging the UK's housing shortage.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB12	The limited infrastructure would not cope with an additional 400 plus families, in terms of commuters to West Byfleet station, school provision and the church. There would also be a risk to the current community feel.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.8, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB13	The limited infrastructure would not cope with an additional 400 plus families, in terms of commuters to West Byfleet station, school provision and the church. There would also be a risk to the current community feel.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 and 3.8, and Section 24.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB12	Pyrford benefits from an unspoilt character and stunning views behind Aviary Road, that are an asset to the wide borough. It would seem short-sighted to develop the area and lose the open green views forever.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. 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
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB13	Pyrford benefits from an unspoilt character and stunning views behind Aviary Road, that are an asset to the wide borough. It would seem short-sighted to develop the area and lose the open green views forever.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 7.0 and 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.</p>	
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB12	Pyrford would lose its unique village identity and become part of a new urban sprawl of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 15.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB13	Pyrford would lose its unique village identity and become part of a new urban sprawl of Greater Woking.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 15.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>The key requirements for the site also note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB12	It would make better economic and environmental sense to develop the numerous brownfield sites across the country as well as green field sites closer to appropriate established infrastructure. Welcomes the Council's views on this important topic and hopes the review process with give consideration to these concerns.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB13	It would make better economic and environmental sense to develop the numerous brownfield sites across the country as well as green field sites closer to appropriate established infrastructure. Welcomes the Council's views on this important topic and hopes the review process with give consideration to these concerns.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB12	Further investment would be needed to provide the necessary local resources.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
479	Sarah	Robinson	GB13	Further investment would be needed to provide the necessary local resources.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
480	Chris	Robinson	GB12	Questions if neighbouring Councils are considering the impact of the ripple effect of multiple developments close to but across council boundaries. Are the ecological impacts of further road widening and other infrastructure being properly assessed? Welcomes the Council's views on this important topic and hopes the review process with give consideration to these concerns.	None stated.	<p>The Council is working with neighbouring Councils to ensure a joined up approach to planning and infrastructure. This is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2 and Section 24.0. In terms of ecological impacts, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	
480	Chris	Robinson	GB13	Questions if neighbouring Councils are considering the impact of the ripple effect of multiple developments close to but across council boundaries. Are the ecological impacts of further road widening and other infrastructure being properly assessed? Welcomes the Council's views on this important topic and hopes the review process will give consideration to these concerns.	None stated.	<p>The Council is working with neighbouring Councils to ensure a joined up approach to planning and infrastructure. This is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, Section 6.0, paragraph 6.2 and Section 24.0. In terms of ecological impacts, during the preparation of the 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
480	Chris	Robinson	GB12	Objects to 400+ new homes on Pyrford's Green Belt despite acknowledging the UK's housing shortage.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
480	Chris	Robinson	GB13	Objects to 400+ new homes on Pyrford's Green Belt despite acknowledging the UK's housing shortage.	None stated.	Objection noted. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
480	Chris	Robinson	GB12	The infrastructure of Pyrford is that of a village, and its limited nature is part of its charm. It would not cope with the extra demand and would need further investment. As well as the additional financial cost, Pyrford would lose its sense of identity and become an extension of Byfleet/ West Byfleet.	None stated.	This point is noted, particularly regarding the sense of identity that Pyrford has and the impact of development. However, some change is necessary to accommodate the future housing need of the Borough. The justification for this need, and the approach to providing adequate infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 3.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
480	Chris	Robinson	GB13	The infrastructure of Pyrford is that of a village, and its limited nature is part of its charm. It would not cope with the extra demand and would need further investment. As well as the additional financial cost, Pyrford would lose its sense of identity and become an extension of Byfleet/ West Byfleet.	None stated.	This point is noted, particularly regarding the sense of identity that Pyrford has and the impact of development. However, some change is necessary to accommodate the future housing need of the Borough. The justification for this need, and the approach to providing adequate infrastructure is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 3.0 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
480	Chris	Robinson	GB12	The road in the area are already congested and are not suitable for significant increases in traffic flows. Their current form, whilst congested, is part of the charm and appeal of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 23.0 and 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
480	Chris	Robinson	GB13	The road in the area are already congested and are not suitable for significant increases in traffic flows. Their current form, whilst congested, is part of the charm and appeal of the area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 23.0 and 24.0. Further to this the Council has engaged Guildford Borough Council in this consultation, in line with the Duty to Cooperate, and will continue to work with them as plans for development in both Boroughs progress, to ensure that negative impacts are minimised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
480	Chris	Robinson	GB12	The unspoilt character in and around Pyrford is an asset for the wider borough, and it seems illogical to develop so near to Aviary Road which is a conservation area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. 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
480	Chris	Robinson	GB13	The unspoilt character in and around Pyrford is an asset for the wider borough, and it seems illogical to develop so near to Aviary Road which is a conservation area.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 19.0 and 23.0. In addition, the landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. 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
480	Chris	Robinson	GB12	There are numerous brownfield sites across the country as well as green field sites closer to appropriate established infrastructure, which would be more economical and appropriate for development.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
480	Chris	Robinson	GB13	There are numerous brownfield sites across the country as well as green field sites closer to appropriate established infrastructure, which would be more economical and appropriate for development.	None stated.	The Council has shown that it has thoroughly assessed reasonable alternative sites through its Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base. This is detailed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 9.0 and 11.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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	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
					Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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 ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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	It is intended to allocate the site for a business use. The site is allocated to meet the accommodation need 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
					by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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</p>	No further modification is 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 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.	
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.		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.	
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 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>	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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 need. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period - see Section 11 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper for detailed response to this particular issue. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influence the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 road 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 road 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 road 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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,	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	No further modification is 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 road unable to handle additional traffic.		Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is comprehensively addressed in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council has also carried out a Sustainability Appraisal of alternative sites in the urban area and in the Green Belt. The proposed allocations are considered the most sustainable when compared against the alternatives considered.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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	No further modification is 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 meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1207	Marlene	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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 need 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. This is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation, the Council is satisfied that the site can be developed without significant flood risk to occupiers. It is also not envisaged that the development will exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance 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 need 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.	
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 developed 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 need of Travellers. Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	
1208	Peter	Robinson	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. This representation has also 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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	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 Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.		on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This particular matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 development need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 development need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period - see Section 11 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper for detailed response to this	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				GBBR 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.		particular issue. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1208	Peter	Robinson	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.	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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.	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local services and retail centres. They do not exactly reflect real-time conditions or peak hour journey times. Its purpose is to make sure that sites are in sustainable locations. The Council has undertaken a Transport Assessment (TA) that assesses the transport/traffic impacts of the proposed allocations. The TA uses real peak time data to inform the modelling. Any mitigation measures that will be necessary will be informed by the Transport Assessment and not the	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with road unable to handle additional traffic.		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.	
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 road 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				been ignored.		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.	
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1208	Peter	Robinson	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	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number 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 need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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>	
1208	Peter	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB7	The site is partly within Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 2. This will result in development being closer to the road which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation need 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 need of Travellers. Development on the site will be directed to the area of the site with the least risk of flooding, i.e. Flood Zone 1. The is considered an enforceable approach that will be clarified in the allocation. The allocation also includes key requirement to ensure that detailed flood risk assessment is carried out to inform the planning application process for any scheme that will come forward for the delivery of the site. With the specifications set out in the key requirements of the allocation,	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					the DPD for the reasons stated.	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.	
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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 need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					stated.		
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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 ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					stated.		
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 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.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The 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 matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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.	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB9	<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</p>	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Domesday Book. Mayford will become part of Greater Woking. Green Belt is fundamental to the separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford. This is only classified as Important in the GBBR. There is a high risk to Woking and Guildford merging if Mayford is developed further. WBC states that land available for development is more viable for removal from the Green Belt. The ownership of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.		of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The ownership of land has not influenced the allocation of sites. This particular matter is addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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 need. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period - see Section 11 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper for detailed response to this particular issue. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity of Mayford or its separation from Guildford. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influence the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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.	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB11	The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis	None stated.	The journey times used in estimating the sustainability of sites by reference to their proximity to key services and facilities provide a consistent baseline in calculating the accessibility to local	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating 7 minutes travel time. This is not the case at peak times, when there is congestion and travel time can be substantially longer. There is poor public transport, a limited bus service and narrow, unlit pedestrian footpaths. There are three single line bridges, and gridlock in the village at peak times. Development of two large sites at Mayford's boundary and as proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with road unable to handle additional traffic.		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.	of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 road 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 road 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB10	Land North of Saunders Lane should not be considered for development as it includes "Escarpments and Rising Ground	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of Landscape Importance" (Policy CS24). Without a Landscape Character Assessment, the GBBR is not valid and it is not clear why this area of landscape importance has been ignored.		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.	
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB8		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	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				The 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).		inconsistency. The Council has used a range of studies to inform the DPD. Collectively they justify the allocation of the sites.	of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB11	The Green Belt Review was inconsistent in its approach. It identified areas of land not to be considered (due to constraints) then recommended land that contained these constraints (including Mayford - the Review rejected the Ten Acre Site as a Traveller site).	None stated.	The methodology for carrying the review is considered sufficiently robust and consistently applied. This issues has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section10. Also see Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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 need of the area is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. see Sections 1, 2 and 4.	
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB7	The TAA suggests the site and its immediate surrounding be explored for potential future expansion. The DPD incorrectly uses the term 'intensification'. This site was never envisaged to be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family. The Council has set aside GBR recommendations.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. The Mayford Centre has no supporting infrastructure and residents living in any major developments would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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	No further modification is 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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.	
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1209	Alexandra	Robinson	GB7	<p>Ten Acre Farm is not currently deliverable as the landowner has not confirmed that the site is available for development. The landowner wishes to develop the site for their own accommodation and not for an increase in Traveller accommodation. Development of the site will be economically viable at a low density.</p> <p>The development of the site would be contrary to the Council's SHLAA 2014.</p>	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	GB7	The GBR considered other options to meet future need for pitches including WOK001 and WOK006. There are also sites with capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined (land at West Hall WGB004a/SHLAABW019b and south of High Road WGB006a/SHLAABY043). These are omitted from the DPD with little explanation.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 requirements will also ensure that the siting, layout and design of the site minimises any adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents and the landscape setting of the area. The Council is satisfied that the combined effects of these requirements will make sure the development of the site is both sustainable and viable.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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 need 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. This 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					stated.	there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance 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 need 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.	
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	GB7	There is a lack of Very Special Circumstances to justify developing the site for Travellers accommodation, including the argument for unmet need. This is highlighted in the comments made by B Lewis MP.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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 ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private	The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				<p>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>	Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.		
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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	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	No further modification is 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.		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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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.	
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 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>	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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 need. The evidence demonstrates that there is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period - see Section 11 of the Council Issues and Matters Topic Paper for detailed response to this particular issue. This matter is comprehensively covered in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is satisfied that the proposals will not undermine the identity	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				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.		of Mayford or its separation from Guildford. This particular matter is addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The ownership of land has not influenced the selection of sites. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 13 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The specific purpose of the Green Belt to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns was not considered relevant in the Green Belt boundary review because by definition Woking and its villages are not classified as historic towns. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations. In addition, the special character of Mayford is recognised by the Council and Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt.	
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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.	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				proposed in the Site Allocations will exacerbate congestion, with road unable to handle additional traffic.		Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20 and 3. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy.	
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 road 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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.	
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	GB7	No independently verified evidence that all Brownfield sites for Traveller sites have been exhausted or why available and viable sites in Green Belt Review are not included but those specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Five Acres) are the ONLY sites put forward.	The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated.	The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the development need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need 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 need over the entire Core Strategy period. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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 need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number 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 need 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 need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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>	
1210	Elizabeth	Robinson	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.	<p>The representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The Council believes that the site can be developed without undermining the overall character of the area and/or the heritage assets of the area. The Council is satisfied that the site is developable and will be available for development. The site can also be developed without significant harm to the general amenity of the occupiers of the site. A number of the proposed allocations in the DPD are sited on land which could have land contamination from previous or historic land uses. This proposed allocation includes a list of key requirements to be met to make the development of the site acceptable. This includes making sure that site specific matters such as contamination are fully assessed and where necessary mitigation measures identified to address adverse impacts. Subject to thorough contamination assessments being carried out and the implementation of any necessary remediation measures, the Council is satisfied that the development of the site is sustainable</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB7	<p>A significant increase in Traveller pitches will reduce the visual amenity of the area and increase risk to wildlife due to an increase domestic animals.</p> <p>Considers the Travelling community to have a negative impact on the local environment.</p> <p>Successive planning inspectors have refused planning permission on the site as it would reduce the openness of the GB</p>	None stated.	<p>The Council treats all members of the community equally and has a duty to ensure there is appropriate housing to meet the need of the whole community.</p> <p>Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.</p> <p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB7	<p>WBC has not demonstrated that it has exhausted all brownfield sites before considering GB. Proposals will destroy the natural beauty of the area.</p> <p>The local road can not cope with any increase in traffic that will be created- particularly in light of proposals for a new school at Egley Road. The road will be at a standstill.</p>	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the lack of consideration of alternative sites has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0</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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB7	Mayford resident, Objects to the increase of Traveller pitches on the site. Believes that Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough. Therefore Mayford already makes a major contribution towards the traveller community and there is no justification for further expansion here.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB8	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.	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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB9	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.	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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB10	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.	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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB11	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.	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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB14	The proposal will fill in the green space between Mayford and Woking, increasing the likelihood of Woking and Guildford merging. No consideration has been given to keeping the areas separate.	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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB14	Wildlife will be wiped in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and is in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0 In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. It is acknowledged that Woking has a variety of heritage assets, and there are sufficient and robust policies to preserve and/or enhance these assets. It is not envisaged that the integrity of any of these assets will be compromised by the proposed allocations.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB8	Wildlife will be wiped in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and is in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0 In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.</p>	
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and is in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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 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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and is in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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 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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped in developed areas with increased risk to the protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath). Reconsider plans. Mayford is unique and is in the Domesday Book.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 14.0</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Nevertheless, the Council recognise that individual sites can provide important habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representer ID 563.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB7	The purpose of the GB is to preserve and not destroy the countryside. The GB should only be altered in exceptional circumstances	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 particularly paragraph 1.9.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB8	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works planned. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB9	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works planned. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB10	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works planned. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB11	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works planned. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of 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
1231	Paul, Gemma	Robinson	GB14	There appears to be no consideration of Mayford's infrastructure. More people will put more strain on infrastructure and no upgrades or improvement works planned. Houses can not be built with no supporting infrastructure. Road safety issues are a concern.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. The draft allocation also sets out in the key requirements for the site that development must contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the mitigation of the impacts of the development of the site. The exact nature of these site specific requirements will be identified through pre-application discussions, informed by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding the lack of 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB7	Object to proposals. It will compromise the principle of Green Belt - to maintain separate and openness between urban areas. No regard shown to Central Government guidance. Will not retain the character separate entity	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the Green Belt purpose of separating towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>It should be noted that draft allocation GB7 would be retained within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies would continue to be applied, namely the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CS6.</p> <p>The representation regarding the openness of the Green Belt has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.3.</p> <p>The Council believes that it has fully complied with national planning policy during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, including its assessment of brownfield sites and the principle of releasing and safeguarding land in the Green Belt. This is set out within Section 4.0, 1.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on local character and identity it should be noted that 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. 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB8	Object to proposals. It will compromise the principle of Green Belt - to maintain separate and openness between urban areas. No regard shown to Central Government guidance. Easy option to development green sites. Will not retain the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the Green Belt purpose of separating towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that it has fully complied with national planning policy during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, including its assessment of brownfield sites and the principle of releasing and safeguarding land in the Green Belt. This is set out within Section 1.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on local character and identity it should be noted that 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. 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</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.	
1637	C	Rocke	GB9	Object to proposals. It will compromise the principle of Green Belt - to maintain separate and openness between urban areas. No regard shown to Central Government guidance. Easy option to development green sites. Will not retain the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the Green Belt purpose of separating towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that it has fully complied with national planning policy during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, including its assessment of brownfield sites and the principle of releasing and safeguarding land in the Green Belt. This is set out within Section 1.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on local character and identity it should be noted that 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. 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB10	Object to proposals. It will compromise the principle of Green Belt - to maintain separate and openness between urban areas. No regard shown to Central Government guidance. Easy option to development green sites. Will not retain the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the Green Belt purpose of separating towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that it has fully complied with national planning policy during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, including its assessment of brownfield sites and the principle of releasing and safeguarding land in the Green Belt. This is set out within Section 1.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on local character and identity it should be noted that 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. 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB11	Object to proposals. It will compromise the principle of Green Belt - to maintain separate and openness between urban areas. No regard shown to Central Government guidance. Easy option to development green sites. Will not retain the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the Green Belt purpose of separating towns has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding the impact on landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>The Council believes that it has fully complied with national planning policy during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, including its assessment of brownfield sites and the principle of releasing and safeguarding land in the Green Belt. This is set out within Section 1.0 and 11.0.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on local character and identity it should be noted that 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. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1637	C	Rocke	GB7	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. Support the Mayford Village Society representations.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB8	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. Support the Mayford Village Society representations.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB9	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. Support the Mayford Village Society representations.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB10	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. Support the Mayford Village Society representations.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
1637	C	Rocke	GB11	No consideration to the impact on infrastructure. Support the Mayford Village Society representations.	None stated.	The representation regarding the impact on infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. 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
1332		Rodgers	GB12	Consider vacant shopping precincts to accommodate more housing	Consider commercial areas to accommodate housing	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0. See also Section 9.0 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1332		Rodgers	GB13	Consider vacant shopping precincts to accommodate more housing	Consider commercial areas to accommodate housing	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0. See also Section 9.0 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1332		Rodgers	GB12	Object to development in Pyrford. Over the years the area has become increasingly urban in character and is sad to see. Consider brownfield sites over Green Belt sites	Consider brownfield sites over greenbelt sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 19.0, 9.0, 11.0 and Section 7.0 In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1332		Rodgers	GB13	Object to development in Pyrford. Over the years the area has become increasingly urban in character and is sad to see. Consider brownfield sites over Green Belt sites	Consider brownfield sites over greenbelt sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0, 19.0, 9.0, 11.0 and Section 7.0 In addition, the Council acknowledges the individual character of Pyrford. This is noted in several Council documents including the Heritage of Woking (2000) and the Woking Character Study (2010).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1332		Rodgers	GB12	There are opportunities for vacant commercial premises to be converted into housing. Consider these further.	Consider vacant commercial buildings to accommodate housing	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0. See also Section 9.0 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1332		Rodgers	GB13	There are opportunities for vacant commercial premises to be converted into housing. Consider these further.	Consider vacant commercial buildings to accommodate housing	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 16.0. See also Section 9.0 and Section 11.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB10	Concerned about removal of the Green Belt. Hook Heath is an area of long standing history and immense natural beauty, with unrestricted views of Guildford and the Surrey Downs. It is unique to Woking. New housing and retail development in the area will not be in keeping with the area and will have a negative impact on the character of the	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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.	No further modification is 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 environment			
45	James	Rogers	GB10	One of the main reasons for a GB is to restrict urban sprawl. Allowing development on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will do the opposite, allowing urban sprawl. The GB is there to separate Hook Heath from Mayford and from Mayford to Woking	Reduction in all site boundaries outlined to restrict scale of development toward vicinity of Hook Heath	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB10	National policy allows release of land from the GB in exceptional circumstances. Where the CS identifies 550 homes will need to be found on GB sites between 2022-2027. WBC have gone further and identified sites for an additional 1200 homes between 2027 -2040. While it may be sensible to look further ahead of the CS, WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances post 2027	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need 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.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB10	The local transport infrastructure, particularly on Egley Road is heavily congested during morning and evening rush hour. It will not cope with additional traffic created by a housing, retail park and school	None stated.	The traffic and infrastructure of the proposals are comprehensively addressed by Section 3 and 20. The Core Strategy was informed by cumulative transport assessment that takes into account potential developments in nearby areas of the County. More importantly, the proposals include a requirement for detailed transport assessment to assess the transport implications of individual schemes and identify appropriate mitigation measures to address them. The Council will continue to work its neighbours and the County Council to address cross boundary transport problems in the area. As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB10	The proposed housing density of 30dph for GB10 and GB11 are excessive to the average density of 5.5dph in Hook Heath and Fisher Hill Conservation Area	Reduction in all site boundaries outlined to restrict scale of development toward vicinity of Hook Heath	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
45	James	Rogers	GB8	One of the main reasons for a GB is to restrict urban sprawl. Allowing development on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will do the opposite, allowing urban sprawl. The GB is there to separate Hook Heath from Mayford and from Mayford to Woking	Reduction in all site boundaries outlined to restrict scale of development toward vicinity of Hook Heath	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB9	One of the main reasons for a GB is to restrict urban sprawl. Allowing development on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will do the opposite, allowing urban sprawl. The GB is there to separate Hook Heath from Mayford and from Mayford to Woking	Reduction in all site boundaries outlined to restrict scale of development toward vicinity of Hook Heath	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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.	
45	James	Rogers	GB11	One of the main reasons for a GB is to restrict urban sprawl. Allowing development on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will do the opposite, allowing urban sprawl. The GB is there to separate Hook Heath from Mayford and from Mayford to Woking	Reduction in all site boundaries outlined to restrict scale of development toward vicinity of Hook Heath	The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4. The Council has carried out a landscape assessment and landscape sensitivity for the sites to accommodate change. The site can be developed without undermining the landscape assets of the area. This particular issue is comprehensively covered in Section 7 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The allocation of the sites will not also undermine the physical separation between Woking and Guildford. This matter has been addressed in Section 12 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB14	One of the main reasons for a GB is to restrict urban sprawl. Allowing development on sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 will do the opposite, allowing urban sprawl. The GB is there to separate Hook Heath from Mayford and from Mayford to Woking	Reduction in all site boundaries outlined to restrict scale of development toward vicinity of Hook Heath	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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 proposals will significantly compromise the physical separation between Mayford and Woking and/or Hook Heath and Woking.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB8	National policy allows release of land from the GB in exceptional circumstances. Where the CS identifies 550 homes will need to be found on GB sites between 2022-2027. WBC have gone further and identified sites for an additional 1200 homes between 2027 -2040. While it may be sensible to look further ahead of the CS, WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances post 2027	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 justification for safeguarding sites is set out in detail in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB9	National policy allows release of land from the GB in exceptional circumstances. Where the CS identifies 550 homes will need to be found on GB sites between 2022-2027. WBC have gone further and identified sites for an additional 1200 homes between 2027 -2040. While it may be sensible to look further ahead of the CS, WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances post 2027	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 justification for safeguarding land to meet future development need between 2027 and 2040 is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
45	James	Rogers	GB11	National policy allows release of land from the GB in exceptional circumstances. Where the CS identifies 550 homes will need to be found on GB sites between 2022-2027. WBC have gone further and identified sites for an additional 1200 homes between 2027 -2040. While it may be sensible to look further ahead of the CS, WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances post 2027	None stated.	The exceptional circumstances case for releasing land from the Green Belt to meet development need on the back of the Core Strategy and for safeguarding land to meet future development need 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
45	James	Rogers	GB14	National policy allows release of land from the GB in exceptional circumstances. Where the CS identifies 550 homes will need to be found on GB sites between 2022-2027. WBC have gone further and identified sites for an additional 1200 homes between 2027 -2040. While it may be sensible to look further ahead of the CS, WBC has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances post 2027	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 justification for safeguarding land to meet future development need between 2027 and 2040 is clearly set out in detail in Section 2 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB7	Objects to the development which compromises the very nature of the Green Belt - to maintain the aspect of separation and openness between urban sites.	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 on the justification for release of Green Belt sites for development, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB8	Objects to the development which compromises the very nature of the Green Belt - to maintain the aspect of separation and openness between urban sites.	None stated.	Objection noted. The principle of Green Belt development and the Council's decision to safeguard land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0. The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of 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
						<p>Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p>	
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB9	Objects to the development which compromises the very nature of the Green Belt - to maintain the aspect of separation and openness between urban sites.	None stated.	<p>Objection noted. The principle of Green Belt development and the Council's decision to safeguard land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB10	Objects to the development which compromises the very nature of the Green Belt - to maintain the aspect of separation and openness between urban sites.	None stated.	<p>Objection noted. The principle of Green Belt development and the Council's decision to safeguard land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB11	Objects to the development which compromises the very nature of the Green Belt - to maintain the aspect of separation and openness between urban sites.	None stated.	<p>Objection noted. The principle of Green Belt development and the Council's decision to safeguard land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundary review assessed parcels of land against the purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Sites GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11 and GB14 are all in parcel 20 of the Green Belt boundary review. The review concluded that development in this parcel would not reduce the gap between the town and the northern edge of Guildford.</p> <p>It is recognised that the separation between Woking and Mayford will be reduced as a result of the proposal. However the identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.</p> <p>The representation regarding landscape and openness has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB7	It is too easy to build on open fields and much harder not to thereby retaining the character and identity of separate areas.	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 on the justification for release of Green Belt sites for development, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB8	It is too easy to build on open fields and much harder not to, thereby retaining the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	As set out in the Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) the housing need in the Borough is around 594 dwellings per year. Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that an annual average of 292 dwellings per year would be suitable and achievable. There is therefore a clear housing need in the Borough. The Council is fully	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and therefore is preparing a Site Allocations DPD to identify sites within the Borough to meet development need. The Site Allocations DPD contains a wide range of sites, including over 50 sites within the existing urban areas of the Borough. By not planning for housing growth, the Council will not be consistent with national policy or meeting the housing need of local people.</p> <p>The principle of Green Belt development and the case for safeguarding land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding character and identity has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB9	It is too easy to build on open fields and much harder not to, thereby retaining the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) the housing need in the Borough is around 594 dwellings per year. Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that an annual average of 292 dwellings per year would be suitable and achievable. There is therefore a clear housing need in the Borough. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and therefore is preparing a Site Allocations DPD to identify sites within the Borough to meet development need. The Site Allocations DPD contains a wide range of sites, including over 50 sites within the existing urban areas of the Borough. By not planning for housing growth, the Council will not be consistent with national policy or meeting the housing need of local people.</p> <p>The principle of Green Belt development and the case for safeguarding land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding character and identity has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB10	It is too easy to build on open fields and much harder not to, thereby retaining the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) the housing need in the Borough is around 594 dwellings per year. Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that an annual average of 292 dwellings per year would be suitable and achievable. There is therefore a clear housing need in the Borough. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and therefore is preparing a Site Allocations DPD to identify sites within the Borough to meet development need. The Site Allocations DPD contains a wide range of sites, including over 50 sites within the existing urban areas of the Borough. By not planning for housing growth, the Council will not be consistent with national policy or meeting the housing need of local people.</p> <p>The principle of Green Belt development and the case for safeguarding land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding character and identity has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB11	It is too easy to build on open fields and much harder not to, thereby retaining the character and identity of separate areas.	None stated.	<p>As set out in the Core Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) the housing need in the Borough is around 594 dwellings per year. Due to the constraints of the Borough, it was agreed that an annual average of 292 dwellings per year would be suitable and achievable. There is therefore a clear housing need in the Borough. The Council is fully committed to the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy and therefore is preparing a Site Allocations DPD to identify sites within the Borough to meet development need. The Site Allocations DPD contains a wide range of sites, including over 50 sites within the existing urban areas of the Borough. By not planning for housing growth, the Council will not be consistent with national policy or meeting the housing need of local people.</p> <p>The principle of Green Belt development and the case for safeguarding land for future development need is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and 2.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding character and identity has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB7	The impact on the infrastructure has not been considered. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to also 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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB8	The impact on the infrastructure has not been considered. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to also 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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB9	The impact on the infrastructure has not been considered. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to also 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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB10	The impact on the infrastructure has not been considered. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to also 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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
582	Sarah	Rogers	GB11	The impact on the infrastructure has not been considered. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy to also 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 response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Archaeology (suggested field nearest to Hillside has possible value)	None stated.	This site is not considered to contain any areas of High Archaeological Potential. Nevertheless Core Strategy Policy CS20 states that on all development sites over 0.4 hectares an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary if in the opinion of the County Archaeologist, an archaeological assessment demonstrates that the site has archaeological potential. This will therefore need to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	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
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Increased Crime	None stated.	There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed land uses for the draft allocation will result in an increase in crime. However the Core Strategy states in CS21: Design that new development should create a safe and secure environment where the opportunities for crime are minimised. At the planning application stage, the Council may also consult with the Police Service (Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDA), Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCO) and Architectural Liaison Officers (ALO)) to make sure that any potential crime and safety issues are addressed.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Increased Noise	None stated.	As noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the scheme will not generate a significant amount of noise pollution that will be to the detriment of local residents or the general environment. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission. Nevertheless the Council has robust policies in place that mitigate the impact of noise pollution on the environment and general amenity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Increased Volume of Traffic would affect the environment	None stated.	The representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6. The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A320. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Loss of Arable and Amenity land	None stated.	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The Council accepts that the removal of this site from the Green Belt will result in a reduction of the amount of Green Belt and amenity land. Whilst the Council sympathises with this concern, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. Taking into account the constraints of the Borough and the available evidence, the proposed allocations are the most sustainable to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy when compared against other reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal Report provides the evidence to support this view. Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development need up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>Through the proposed allocation of GB14 for green infrastructure purposes as well as a number of proposed SANG sites (GB17-GB22), the Council believes that there will be a number of open amenity spaces across the borough as a result of the DPD.</p>	
Loss of Green Fields and Escarpment Featured Escarpment Feature	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 green fields.</p> <p>As noted within the Green Belt boundary review and the key requirements in the draft Site Allocations DPD, the escarpment around Mayford will be an important landscape consideration in the preparation of any development scheme. This will make sure that the integrity of the escarpment is not undermined.</p> <p>Further information regarding the impact on landscape is set out in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 7.0.</p> <p>Whilst not underplaying the significance of the benefits of Green Belt land to individual local</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation				

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
		communities, the overall total of Green Belt land proposed to be released from the Green Belt to meet development need 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.					
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Object to releasing Green Belt Green Belt protects countryside and wildlife for now and future generations.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the release of Green Belt land for development need has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0.</p> <p>In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a 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>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 need up to 2040 is about 3.46% of the total area of the Green Belt. Presently, the Green Belt is about 63.27% of the total area of the Borough. When all the allocated sites have been developed the Green Belt will be about 61.8% of the total area of the Borough. The amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Pollution	None stated.	New recreation space will incorporate floodlighting which will increase light pollution. However as noted in the Officer's Report to the Planning Committee for the proposed school and leisure facilities, the proposed scheme will not have an adverse impact on residential properties. This is due to the separation distances between the proposed land uses and the adjacent residential properties and the Planning Conditions attached to the planning permission.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The site is 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.	
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Suggests exploring other possible Brownfield sites as per Government Directives. Aware that representations received will be made public.	Explore other possible brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0 and Section 11.0. The representations received from the Regulation 18 consultation will be made publically accessible both online and at Civic Offices.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Wildlife protection	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
987	K.J.	Rogers	GB8	Woking and Mayford should not be merged	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
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB10	Consider the Council's plans to let local residents know about the development insufficient, calling into question the validity of the consultation period. We would expect the Council to have made a considerable effort to let the people of Woking, but have not seen any plans regarding the development in the shopping centres or any Council representatives attempting to make the local population aware. Many people, who may oppose the development, unaware of it. Woking Borough Council should not go ahead with the development.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that was extensive consultation of the DPD. The Council's approach to consultation is set out in detail in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue to explore potential improvements to its consultation approach. It is important to highlight that the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Local Development Scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB11	Consider the Council's plans to let local residents know about the development insufficient, calling into question the validity of the consultation period. We would expect the Council to have made a considerable effort to let the people of Woking, but have not seen any plans regarding the development in the shopping centres or any Council representatives attempting to make the local population aware. Many people, who may oppose the development, unaware of it. Woking Borough Council should not go ahead with the development.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that was extensive consultation of the DPD. The Council's approach to consultation is set out in detail in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue to explore potential improvements to its consultation approach. It is important to highlight that the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Local Development Scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB14	Consider the Council's plans to let local residents know about the development insufficient, calling into question the validity of the consultation period. We would expect the Council to have made a considerable effort to let the people	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that was extensive consultation of the DPD. The Council's approach to consultation is set out in detail in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue to explore potential improvements to its consultation approach. It is important to highlight that the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Local	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				of Woking, but have not seen any plans regarding the development in the shopping centres or any Council representatives attempting to make the local population aware. Many people, who may oppose the development, unaware of it. Woking Borough Council should not go ahead with the development.		Development Scheme.	
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB8	Consider the Council's plans to let local residents know about the development insufficient, calling into question the validity of the consultation period. We would expect the Council to have made a considerable effort to let the people of Woking, but have not seen any plans regarding the development in the shopping centres or any Council representatives attempting to make the local population aware. Many people, who may oppose the development, unaware of it. Woking Borough Council should not go ahead with the development.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that was extensive consultation of the DPD. The Council's approach to consultation is set out in detail in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue to explore potential improvements to its consultation approach. It is important to highlight that the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Local Development Scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB9	Consider the Council's plans to let local residents know about the development insufficient, calling into question the validity of the consultation period. We would expect the Council to have made a considerable effort to let the people of Woking, but have not seen any plans regarding the development in the shopping centres or any Council representatives attempting to make the local population aware. Many people, who may oppose the development, unaware of it. Woking Borough Council should not go ahead with the development.	None stated.	The Council is satisfied that was extensive consultation of the DPD. The Council's approach to consultation is set out in detail in Section 6 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council will continue to explore potential improvements to its consultation approach. It is important to highlight that the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Local Development Scheme.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB10	Areas of Mayford are to be released from the Green Belt to create a "defensible boundary". The proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties. Development will lead to habitat loss, forcing wildlife (sighted species listed) to move elsewhere, increasing competition including on nearby heaths.	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. Issues about flooding are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. All the proposed sites are outside the exclusion zone from the SPAs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB11	Areas of Mayford are to be released from the Green Belt to create a "defensible boundary". The proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water	None stated.	The Green Belt boundary review report provides sufficient evidence that the release of the proposed allocated sites from the Green Belt will enable a defensible boundary to be drawn that will endure over a long period of time beyond the Core Strategy period. Where the recommendations of the Green Belt boundary review report had not been accepted by the Council, a clear reason has been given. The proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn to follow the edge of the development sites in Mayford. For sites GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB14	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				and flood risk to surrounding properties. Development will lead to habitat loss, forcing wildlife (sighted species listed) to move elsewhere, increasing competition including on nearby heaths.		<p>there will be a continuation of the existing urban area which is well defined by Saunders Lane to the south and Egley Road to the east. The Green Belt boundary to the west has been defined by site GB11 which is adjacent to the Hook Heath escarpment. This will protect the purpose of the Green Belt and not undermine the integrity of the escarpment.</p> <p>Site GB7 will continue to remain within the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt boundary will not change in this particular location. 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. Issues about flooding are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. All the proposed sites are outside the exclusion zone from the SPAs.</p>	
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB14	Areas of Mayford are to be released from the Green Belt to create a "defensible boundary". The proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties. Development will lead to habitat loss, forcing wildlife (sighted species listed) to move elsewhere, increasing competition including on nearby heaths.	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. Issues about flooding are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. All the proposed sites are outside the exclusion zone from the SPAs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB8	Areas of Mayford are to be released from the Green Belt to create a "defensible boundary". The proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties. Development will lead to habitat loss, forcing wildlife (sighted species listed) to move elsewhere, increasing competition including on nearby	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
				heaths.		<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. Issues about flooding are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. All the proposed sites are outside the exclusion zone from the SPAs.</p>	
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB9	Areas of Mayford are to be released from the Green Belt to create a "defensible boundary". The proposed changes would make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment. Mayford is key area for absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding; development will increase surface water and flood risk to surrounding properties. Development will lead to habitat loss, forcing wildlife (sighted species listed) to move elsewhere, increasing competition including on nearby heaths.	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. Issues about flooding are comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5. During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. All the proposed sites are outside the exclusion zone from the SPAs.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB10	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. A seven minute journey from Mayford to Woking was estimated using Google Maps timings; at peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. No consideration given to increased pressure on limited community services. There are no plans to create a new GP or infant/primary school places or new residents' public transport need.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people. The general approach to addressing the infrastructure need 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.	
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB8	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. A seven minute journey from Mayford to Woking was estimated using Google Maps timings; at peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. No consideration given to increased pressure on limited community services. There are no plans to create a new GP or infant/primary school places or new residents' public transport need.	None stated.	<p>The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people. 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 Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB9	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. A seven minute journey from Mayford to Woking was estimated using Google Maps timings; at peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. No consideration given to increased pressure on limited community services. There are no plans to create a new GP or infant/primary school places or new residents' public transport need.	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 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.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB11	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. A seven minute journey from Mayford to Woking was estimated using Google Maps timings; at peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. No consideration given to increased pressure on limited community services. There are no plans to create a new GP or infant/primary school places or new residents' public transport need.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and</p>	No further modification is 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 need 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 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.	
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB14	The GBBR recommend Mayford on the basis of proximity to a Local Centre. A seven minute journey from Mayford to Woking was estimated using Google Maps timings; at peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour. No consideration given to increased pressure on limited community services. There are no plans to create a new GP or infant/primary school places or new residents' public transport need.	None stated.	The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need 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 Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB10	Accept there may be a need for a secondary school in the South Woking, however the site would be only two miles from the nearest secondary school, Winston Churchill. A site closer to Old Woking would mean that Hoe Valley secondary school would be equidistant with the other schools, ensuring coverage and minimising travelling time. Whilst a school may be "exceptional circumstances" in the Green Belt, the leisure centre, running track and housing do not. National Policy states that housing need – including Traveller sites – does not justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The need for this level of housing is unproven. Insufficient consideration given to building more high density housing in the town centre or building on brownfield sites. It is not clear housing would be for local people. The running track would be used by a small number of people in the community, there is no demonstrated overwhelming need justifying "exceptional circumstances". Woking Council's original intention was to build a running track on the other side of town. Local people already have access to the leisure centre.	None stated.	The application for the school and leisure facilities now has the benefit of planning approval. The justification for the release of Green Belt land for development including Travellers accommodation is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB14	Accept there may be a need for a secondary school in the South Woking, however the site would be only two miles from the nearest secondary school, Winston Churchill. A site	None stated.	The school and Leisure facilities now has planning permission. The Site is allocated for a school and residential development. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1, 2.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				closer to Old Woking would mean that Hoe Valley secondary school would be equidistant with the other schools, ensuring coverage and minimising travelling time. Whilst a school may be "exceptional circumstances" in the Green Belt, the leisure centre, running track and housing do not. National Policy states that housing need – including Traveller sites – does not justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The need for this level of housing is unproven. Insufficient consideration given to building more high density housing in the town centre or building on brownfield sites. It is not clear housing would be for local people. The running track would be used by a small number of people in the community, there is no demonstrated overwhelming need justifying "exceptional circumstances". Woking Council's original intention was to build a running track on the other side of town. Local people already have access to the leisure centre.			
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB11	Accept there may be a need for a secondary school in the South Woking, however the site would be only two miles from the nearest secondary school, Winston Churchill. A site closer to Old Woking would mean that Hoe Valley secondary school would be equidistant with the other schools, ensuring coverage and minimising travelling time. Whilst a school may be "exceptional circumstances" in the Green Belt, the leisure centre, running track and housing do not. National Policy states that housing need – including Traveller sites – does not justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The need for this level of housing is unproven. Insufficient consideration given to building more high density housing in the town centre or building on brownfield sites. It is not clear housing would be for local people. The running track would be used by a small number of people in the community, there is no demonstrated overwhelming need justifying "exceptional circumstances". Woking Council's original intention was to build a running track on the other side of town. Local people already have access to the leisure centre.	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre already has planning permission. 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 the development need of the area. There is not sufficient brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, see Section 11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB8	Accept there may be a need for a secondary school in the South Woking, however the site would be only two miles from the nearest secondary school, Winston Churchill. A site closer to Old Woking would mean that Hoe Valley secondary school would be equidistant with the other schools, ensuring coverage and minimising travelling time. Whilst a school may be "exceptional circumstances" in the Green Belt, the leisure centre, running track and housing do not. National Policy states that housing need – including Traveller sites – does not justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The need for this level of housing is unproven. Insufficient consideration given to building more high density housing in the town centre or building on brownfield sites. It is not clear housing would be for local people. The running track would be used by a small number of people in the community, there is no demonstrated overwhelming need justifying "exceptional circumstances". Woking Council's original intention was to build a running track on the other side of town. Local people already have access to the leisure centre.	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre now has planning permission. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB9	Accept there may be a need for a secondary school in the South Woking, however the site would be only two miles from the nearest secondary school, Winston Churchill. A site closer to Old Woking would mean that Hoe Valley secondary school would be equidistant with the other schools, ensuring coverage and minimising travelling time. Whilst a school may	None stated.	The school and the leisure centre now has planning permission. The Council has assessed the capacity of the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need including the accommodation need of Travellers is comprehensively 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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				be "exceptional circumstances" in the Green Belt, the leisure centre, running track and housing do not. National Policy states that housing need – including Traveller sites – does not justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The need for this level of housing is unproven. Insufficient consideration given to building more high density housing in the town centre or building on brownfield sites. It is not clear housing would be for local people. The running track would be used by a small number of people in the community, there is no demonstrated overwhelming need justifying "exceptional circumstances". Woking Council's original intention was to build a running track on the other side of town. Local people already have access to the leisure centre.			
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB10	Egley Road is a busy road at peak times with queuing traffic. The construction of the housing, leisure and education facilities will significantly increase the number of vehicles at all times, leading to gridlock. Very worried about the greater strain on transport infrastructure. There is no strategy in place to deal with this or to upgrade surrounding road. Air quality will deteriorate as a result, a health concern and unsustainable.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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 need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The Council has robust policies in the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD to prevent unacceptable levels of pollution as a result of development that cannot be mitigated.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB8	Egley Road is a busy road at peak times with queuing traffic. The construction of the housing, leisure and education facilities will significantly increase the number of vehicles at all times, leading to gridlock. Very worried about the greater strain on transport infrastructure. There is no strategy in place to deal with this or to upgrade surrounding road. Air quality will deteriorate as a result, a health concern and unsustainable.	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB9	Egley Road is a busy road at peak times with queuing traffic. The construction of the housing, leisure and education facilities will significantly increase the number of vehicles at	None stated.	<p>The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				all times, leading to gridlock. Very worried about the greater strain on transport infrastructure. There is no strategy in place to deal with this or to upgrade surrounding road. Air quality will deteriorate as a result, a health concern and unsustainable.		As part of Transport 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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area.	
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB11	Egley Road is a busy road at peak times with queuing traffic. The construction of the housing, leisure and education facilities will significantly increase the number of vehicles at all times, leading to gridlock. Very worried about the greater strain on transport infrastructure. There is no strategy in place to deal with this or to upgrade surrounding road. Air quality will deteriorate as a result, a health concern and unsustainable.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB14	Egley Road is a busy road at peak times with queuing traffic. The construction of the housing, leisure and education facilities will significantly increase the number of vehicles at all times, leading to gridlock. Very worried about the greater strain on transport infrastructure. There is no strategy in place to deal with this or to upgrade surrounding road. Air quality will deteriorate as a result, a health concern and unsustainable.	None stated.	<p>The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet future development need is comprehensively addressed by the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1 and 2. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD is addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper (Section 3.0). The way that the traffic impacts of the proposals are assessed is comprehensively addressed in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need of local people and therefore help to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition planning permission has recently been granted for a new secondary school and leisure centre at the site known as 'Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road (GB8)'. The provision of this infrastructure will further support the daily need of local people.</p> <p>As part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in public transport service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies DPD has robust policies to ensure that development does not lead to unacceptable pollution that cannot be mitigated. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the Clinical Commission Groups to see how well provision could be aligned to the proposed development to avoid unacceptable standards of provision in the area	
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB10	We live in Barnsbury and strongly object to the proposed housing, education and leisure facilities in South Woking, specifically GB8, GB9, GB10, GB1 and GB14. We have serious concerns. Barnsbury would change from a quiet estate on the green outskirts to an urbanised area with heavy traffic. Mayford will lose its integrity and village character. Development would be unsympathetic to the village and encroach on the Green Belt between and merge Woking and Guildford, resulting in loss of natural beauty and wildlife habitat.	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. The character and identity of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. The traffic and infrastructure implications of the proposals are addressed in Sections 20 and 3 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposals would have significant adverse impacts on Barnsbury Estate that cannot be mitigated.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB11	We live in Barnsbury and strongly object to the proposed housing, education and leisure facilities in South Woking, specifically GB8, GB9, GB10, GB1 and GB14. We have serious concerns. Barnsbury would change from a quiet estate on the green outskirts to an urbanised area with heavy traffic. Mayford will lose its integrity and village character. Development would be unsympathetic to the village and encroach on the Green Belt between and merge Woking and Guildford, resulting in loss of natural beauty and wildlife habitat.	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 proposal for the school and leisure facilities now has a planning permission. The traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Issues and Matter Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB14	We live in Barnsbury and strongly object to the proposed housing, education and leisure facilities in South Woking, specifically GB8, GB9, GB10, GB1 and GB14. We have serious concerns. Barnsbury would change from a quiet estate on the green outskirts to an urbanised area with heavy traffic. Mayford will lose its integrity and village character. Development would be unsympathetic to the village and encroach on the Green Belt between and merge Woking and Guildford, resulting in loss of natural beauty and wildlife habitat.	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It not envisaged that the proposals will undermine the physical separation between Mayford and Guildford. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB8	We live in Barnsbury and strongly object to the proposed housing, education and leisure facilities in South Woking, specifically GB8, GB9, GB10, GB1 and GB14. We have serious concerns. Barnsbury would change from a quiet estate on the green outskirts to an urbanised area with heavy traffic. Mayford will lose its integrity and village character. Development would be unsympathetic to the village and encroach on the Green Belt between and merge Woking and Guildford, resulting in loss of natural beauty and wildlife habitat.	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need over the plan period. This particular issue is addressed in detail in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. It is not envisaged that the proposal will compromise the physical separation between Woking and Guildford or lead to significant urban sprawl. This matter is addressed in detail in Section 12 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The character of Mayford is protected by Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1185	Paul, Claire	Rogers	GB9	We live in Barnsbury and strongly object to the proposed housing, education and leisure facilities in South Woking, specifically GB8, GB9, GB10, GB1 and GB14. We have serious concerns. Barnsbury would change from a quiet estate on the green outskirts to an urbanised area with heavy traffic. Mayford will lose its integrity and village character. Development would be unsympathetic to the village and encroach on the Green Belt between and merge Woking and Guildford, resulting in loss of natural beauty and wildlife habitat.	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 need of the area. There is not sufficient land in the urban area to meet development need 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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						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 traffic implications of the proposals is addressed in detail in Section 20 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Amenity lighting produces light pollution - what mitigation is proposed?	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposals will ensure that the development of the sites addresses archaeological issues on the site in accordance with Policy Cs20 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposals will ensure that the development of the sites addresses archaeological issues on the site in accordance with Policy Cs20 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation need for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	Based on the available evidence it is not expected that the proposal will affect the most versatile agricultural land in the area. The Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape of the sites to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence as explained in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. The proposals will not adversely impact on designated open spaces.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						Strategy 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.	
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	NO to removing land from Green Belt	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation need for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	The Council recognises the impact of traffic on pollution and has ensured that the traffic impacts of the proposals are fully assessed. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policies to make sure the development impacts on pollution are appropriately controlled.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
247	Keith	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will be compromised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about impact on archaeology	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposals will ensure that the development of the sites addresses archaeological issues on the site in accordance with Policy Cs20 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased flooding	None stated.	The flood risk implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in Section 5 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the proposals will put occupants of the development at any risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals. The proposals are sufficiently informed by robust and adequate evidence base, including a sequential test.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation need for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
							of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Amenity lighting produces light pollution - no mitigation proposed?	None stated.	The key requirements of the proposals will ensure that the development of the sites addresses archaeological issues on the site in accordance with Policy Cs20 of the Core Strategy.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	Based on the available evidence it is not expected that the proposal will affect the most versatile agricultural land in the area. The Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape of the sites to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence as explained in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. The proposals will not adversely impact on designated open spaces.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about loss of green fields and landscape features (Escarpments)	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
248	P	Rooney	GB8	NO to removing land from Green Belt	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation need for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	The Council recognises the impact of traffic on pollution and has ensured that the traffic impacts of the proposals are fully assessed. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by	No further modification is 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 specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policies to make sure the development impacts on pollution are appropriately controlled.	
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
248	P	Rooney	GB8	Concerned about the merging of Woking and Mayford	None stated.	The sites have been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another. Based on the evidence, it is not expected that the physical separation between Woking and Guildford will be compromised.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
891	Krista	Rooney	GB5	Object to the release of Byfleet's remaining Green Belt. There are hardly any green spaces remaining. Do not want to live in a village without green spaces.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough and sympathises with the concern set out in the representation. An even spread of development across the Borough 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 Overall the Site Allocations DPD proposes to remove 3.46% of Green Belt land from across the Borough, including Byfleet, West Byfleet, Pyrford. This is to meet development need up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relative. therefore relative. The key requirements for the site note that development must include open space and landscaping as part of any scheme and that trees of amenity value should be retained.be retained.retained.be retained.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
891	Krista	Rooney	General	Object to the release of Byfleet's remaining Green Belt. There are hardly any green spaces remaining. Do not want to live in a village without green spaces.	None stated.	The Council accepts that the proposed allocation of sites for development is not evenly spread across the Borough and sympathises with the concern set out in the representation. An even spread of development across the Borough 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 need up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						The key requirements for the site note that development must include open space and landscaping as part of any scheme and that trees of amenity value should be retained.	
891	Krista	Rooney	GB5	Most of Byfleet floods and further development will make this worse.	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
891	Krista	Rooney	GB6	Most of Byfleet floods and further development will make this worse.	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
891	Krista	Rooney	GB5	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it worse.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation need of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the 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
891	Krista	Rooney	GB6	The road network is at capacity and further development will make it worse.	None stated.	<p>The draft Site Allocations DPD does not allocate the site for a private school. The Council is seeking to allocate the site for an employment-led mixed use development to include quality offices and research premises and residential including affordable housing and housing to meet the accommodation need of the elderly. The Council believe that this is an important employment site as no other similar sites are available in the borough. The existing planning application for the proposed private school and residential development is a developer led scheme that will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access and improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
891	Krista	Rooney	GB5	Local amenities and services will not be able to cope.	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>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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
891	Krista	Rooney	GB6	Local amenities and services will not be able to cope.	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>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 need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
891	Krista	Rooney	GB5	Areas with less housing and more green spaces should be considered before Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a comprehensive review of both the Green Belt and the existing urban areas for future development sites. This has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and 11.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
891	Krista	Rooney	GB6	Areas with less housing and more green spaces should be considered before Byfleet.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a comprehensive review of both the Green Belt and the existing urban areas for future development sites. This has been set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 9.0 and 11.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
821	Gill	Rose	GB16	The A245 is constantly gridlocked and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6.</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access 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</p>	No further modification is 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.	
821	Gill	Rose	General	Objecting to release Green Belt land in Byfleet and surrounding areas. The petition against building in the Green Belt has been ignored.	None stated.	The Byfleet Petition states 'we the undersigned residents of Byfleet, strongly object to any further erosion of our Green Belt, especially in the area surrounding Murrays Lane. We therefore ask Woking Borough Council to do their utmost to preserve this last small area of countryside around the village'. The Council has taken the petition into account as a representation to the Regulation 18 consultation and has formally responded under Representor ID 1524.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
821	Gill	Rose	General	Green Belt is precious. Building has already taken place on a flood plain which may well change the areas to be flooded instead. Previous agricultural uses on the site were not greatly affected by flooding. Green Belt is shrinking and other sites should be developed, as once it is built on it is gone forever. The plans will remove most of our Green Belt but preserve most of Woking's.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding the principle of Green Belt development and alternative sites that the Council has considered has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 9.0 and 11.0.</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 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 need 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
1409	Nick	Rose	GB12	The proposals do not take account of the environmental impact on surrounding fields and waterways through greater population densities.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues, and development will also need to meet requirements on noise, air and water pollution, as highlighted in Core Strategy Policy CS21 and the emerging Development Management DPD policies (due to be examined in May 2016).</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the 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
1409	Nick	Rose	GB13	The proposals do not take account of the environmental impact on surrounding fields and waterways through greater population densities.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 5.0. In addition, during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless this site will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues, and development will also need to meet requirements on noise, air and water pollution, as highlighted in Core Strategy Policy CS21</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						and the emerging Development Management DPD policies (due to be examined in May 2016). The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1409	Nick	Rose	GB12	Saddens me at the impact of the areas I knew growing up, including Pyrford Cricket ground, Pyrford Common and its playground and the canal, which would become more overcrowded and less enjoyable for all. These outdoor spaces would reminiscent of parts of suburban London, not the Surrey countryside.	None stated.	The draft DPD makes plans for additional green infrastructure, by allocating sites specifically for this purpose, and by making it a key requirement for this specific site to provide 4 hectares of open space. This will help lessen any impact of an increased population on existing open spaces. The draft allocation also requires development to incorporate appropriate, with regard to the site's setting; to retain trees and add to planting. Furthermore the Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1409	Nick	Rose	GB13	Saddens me at the impact of the areas I knew growing up, including Pyrford Cricket ground, Pyrford Common and its playground and the canal, which would become more overcrowded and less enjoyable for all. These outdoor spaces would reminiscent of parts of suburban London, not the Surrey countryside.	None stated.	The draft DPD makes plans for additional green infrastructure, by allocating sites specifically for this purpose, and also by making it a key requirement for this specific site to provide green infrastructure and formal and informal recreation space. This will help lessen any impact of an increased population on existing open spaces. Furthermore the Core Strategy Policy CS17 states that all proposals for new residential development will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space and green infrastructure. The draft allocation also requires development to undertake a landscape assessment, retain visual openness and retain tree belts and mature trees, and be designed to fit the context of the site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1409	Nick	Rose	GB12	Concerned about the proposals and the significant impact that this level and concentration of housing will have on local infrastructure and services, particularly on schools, GPs and shops. Also concerned about the impacts on West Byfleet, Ripley and to some extent Woking itself.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. With regard to GP surgeries, The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1409	Nick	Rose	GB13	Concerned about the proposals and the significant impact that this level and concentration of housing will have on local infrastructure and services, particularly on schools, GPs and shops. Also concerned about the impacts on West Byfleet, Ripley and to some extent Woking itself.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. With regard to GP surgeries, The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB7	The consultative documents refer to Mayford's centre, but from residents' point of view, this consists of a newsagents and hairdresser, and are totally inadequate for hundreds of new residents.	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 need of those living locally, however the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance 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 need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB9	The consultative documents refer to Mayford's centre, but from residents' point of view, this consists of a newsagents and hairdresser, and are totally inadequate for hundreds of new residents.	None stated.	This comment is noted. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support new development can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Further to this, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity 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 need 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 need of local people.	
1424	Roy	Rose	GB10	The consultative documents refer to Mayford's centre, but from residents' point of view, this consists of a newsagents and hairdresser, and are totally inadequate for hundreds of new residents.	None stated.	<p>This comment is noted. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support new development can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Further to this, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity 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 need 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 need of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB11	The consultative documents refer to Mayford's centre, but from residents' point of view, this consists of a newsagents and hairdresser, and are totally inadequate for hundreds of new residents.	None stated.	<p>This comment is noted. The general approach to infrastructure provision to support new development can be found in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0. Further to this, the proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity 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 need 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 need of local people.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB7	There is already a concentration of Travellers sites to the south of Woking. Ten Acre Farm cannot support additional pitches.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 22.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB9	Development implies the removal of the existing garden centre, a valuable facility for residents of the south of Woking.	None stated.	The increase in the population expected as a result of the development proposed in this document would place greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in Mayford. The opportunity to provide an greater element of retail/community development at site GB9 would help 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 need of local people and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. Any proposed development could help provide an alternative community resource to that currently provided at the garden centre, and would be encouraged as part of Core Strategy Policy CS19 Social and Community Infrastructure.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB10	Removal of the site from Green Belt would destroy the character of Mayford and create an unacceptable environment for existing residents.	None stated.	The identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB11	Removal of the site from Green Belt would destroy the character of Mayford and create an unacceptable environment for existing residents.	None stated.	The identity and character of Mayford will not be undermined as it is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt. The representation is further addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 21.0 and 23.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB9	The additional use of the area for residential development would add unacceptable burdens on local road and services and is likely to worsen flood risk in a recognised flood plain.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB10	The additional use of the area for residential development would add unacceptable burdens on local road and services and is likely to worsen flood risk in a recognised flood plain.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB11	The additional use of the area for residential development would add unacceptable burdens on local road and services and is likely to worsen flood risk in a recognised flood plain.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB7	The existing road network through Mayford is heavily congested and additional traffic generated by significant residential development would exacerbate this.	None stated.	This representation 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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB9	The existing road network through Mayford is heavily congested and additional traffic generated by significant residential development would exacerbate this.	None stated.	This representation 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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB10	The existing road network through Mayford is heavily congested and additional traffic generated by significant residential development would exacerbate this.	None stated.	This representation 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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB11	The existing road network through Mayford is heavily congested and additional traffic generated by significant residential development would exacerbate this.	None stated.	This representation 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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB8	The planning application for the school proposes gross overdevelopment on Green belt land. The additional use of the area for residential development would add unacceptable burdens on local road and services and is likely to worsen flood risk in a recognised flood plain.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Section 5.0. The case to justify the school development at the Egley Road site can be found within the planning application (ref PLAN/2015/0703) in report to the Council's Planning Committee.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB7	The risk of flooding is well known in the area, and considerable flood prevention has been undertaken to support development of Willow Reach. The additional water runoff from concreting this land is likely to overwhelm measures taken so far.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4.0, paragraph 4.10	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1424	Roy	Rose	GB9	The risk of flooding is well known in the area, and considerable flood prevention has been undertaken to support development of Willow Reach. The additional water runoff from concreting this land is likely to overwhelm measures taken so far.	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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB10	The risk of flooding is well known in the area, and considerable flood prevention has been undertaken to support development of Willow Reach. The additional water runoff from concreting this land is likely to overwhelm measures taken so far.	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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB11	The risk of flooding is well known in the area, and considerable flood prevention has been undertaken to support development of Willow Reach. The additional water runoff from concreting this land is likely to overwhelm measures taken so far.	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
1424	Roy	Rose	GB7	It would compromise the adjoining SSSI.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
845	Zoe	Ross	GB4	Byfleet has limited Green Belt land and it should be preserved. The more people, the more demand there is on local authorities.	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).	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<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 need up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The Council has outlined the existing and future infrastructure need of the Borough. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	
845	Zoe	Ross	GB5	Byfleet has limited Green Belt land and it should be preserved. The more people, the more demand there is on local authorities.	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 need up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The Council has outlined the existing and future infrastructure need of the Borough. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
845	Zoe	Ross	UA1	Byfleet has limited Green Belt land and it should be preserved. The more people, the more demand there is on local authorities.	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 need up to 2040 and the amount of land being proposed to be released is therefore relatively modest.</p> <p>The Council has outlined the existing and future infrastructure need of the Borough. This has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
845	Zoe	Ross	GB4	Consider the congestion on A245 and the impact of further development.	None stated.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
845	Zoe	Ross	GB5	Consider the congestion on A245 and the impact of further development.	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
845	Zoe	Ross	UA1	Consider the congestion on A245 and the impact of further development.	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
845	Zoe	Ross	GB4	Comments are representative of any major developments in and around Byfleet, which is a small village between larger towns. Need infrastructure to support the growing population and house building. Where are the new healthcare facilities going to be? There are long waiting times for doctor appointments locally. Developments should factor this in. Why should the lives of those already living in the area be so negatively impacted.	None stated.	<p>The Council has considered a number of alternative sites across the Borough for development. These are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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>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
845	Zoe	Ross	GB5	Comments are representative of any major developments in and around Byfleet, which is a small village between larger towns. Need infrastructure to support the growing population and house building. Where are the new healthcare facilities going to be? There are long waiting times for doctor appointments locally. Developments should factor this in. Why should the lives of those already living in the area be so negatively impacted.	None stated.	<p>The Council has considered a number of alternative sites across the Borough for development. These are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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>There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
845	Zoe	Ross	UA1	Comments are representative of any major developments in and around Byfleet, which is a small village between larger towns. Need infrastructure to support the growing population and house building. Where are the new healthcare facilities going to be? There are long waiting times for doctor appointments locally. Developments should factor this in. Why should the lives of those already living in the area be so negatively impacted.	None stated.	<p>The Council has considered a number of alternative sites across the Borough for development. These are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate GP provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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>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
968	Sarah	Ross	GB12	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The community want Pyrford to remain a village. Appreciate the quietness of surrounding countryside. Additional development will put a strain on village infrastructure and services.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure and community services has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
968	Sarah	Ross	GB13	Object to development proposals in Pyrford. The community want Pyrford to remain a village. Appreciate the quietness of surrounding countryside. Additional development will put a strain on village infrastructure and services.	None stated.	<p>This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 21.0 and 23.0.</p> <p>The representation regarding infrastructure and community services has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0. In addition, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that at present there is adequate medical provision to meet overall demand in the Borough. Whilst this is the case, it is also accepted that there might be locally specific pressures of over subscription that need to be addressed. Whilst traditionally health provision reacts to meet projected demand, the Council is seeking to work with the 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
968	Sarah	Ross	GB12	Historic buildings and CAs would be threatened. Wildlife would be threatened. Will negatively affect the rural feel of the village due to the scale of development. Accepts more houses are needed. Development should enlarge towns, not make a village a town.	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the DPD will have significant adverse impacts on the heritage assets of the area. This is confirmed by the evidence in the SA Report. The Core Strategy (Policy SC20) and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD (Policy DM20) has robust policies to conserve the heritage assets of the area as a result of development impacts. Historic England has also confirmed that they are satisfied that the relationship of the Site Allocations DPD to the policies of the Woking Core Strategy will ensure that development takes place in a sustainable form that reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and by definition, this includes the objective to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements.</p>	No further modification is proposed 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>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>Whilst the Council sympathises with the concern in the representation, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. 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>	
968	Sarah	Ross	GB13	<p>Historic buildings and CAs would be threatened. Wildlife would be threatened. Will negatively affect the rural feel of the village due to the scale of development. Accepts more houses are needed. Development should enlarge towns, not make a village a town.</p>	None stated.	<p>It is not envisaged that the DPD will have significant adverse impacts on the heritage assets of the area. This is confirmed by the evidence in the SA Report. The Core Strategy (Policy SC20) and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD (Policy DM20) has robust policies to conserve the heritage assets of the area as a result of development impacts. Historic England has also confirmed that they are satisfied that the relationship of the Site Allocations DPD to the policies of the Woking Core Strategy will ensure that development takes place in a sustainable form that reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and by definition, this includes the objective to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>Most of the housing need for the Borough is internally generated. Consequently, it is envisaged that planning to meet that need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of some areas/war. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental standards in accordance with the environmental/climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined.</p> <p>Whilst the Council sympathises with the concern in the representation, it has ensured through a number of studies that any land that is released from the Green Belt will not undermine its overall purpose and integrity. 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
388	David	Rousell	GB13	<p>Considers the proposals for Byfleets and Pyrford to be unacceptable. There has been no consideration with regards to local infrastructure</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, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the 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 road. 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>	
388	David	Rousell	GB15	Considers the proposals for Byfleets and Pyrford to be unacceptable. There has been no consideration with regards to local infrastructure	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
388	David	Rousell	GB4	Considers the proposals for Byfleets and Pyrford to be unacceptable. There has been no consideration with regards to local infrastructure	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 road. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	
388	David	Rousell	GB5	Considers the proposals for Byfleets and Pyrford to be unacceptable. There has been no consideration with regards to local infrastructure	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 road. 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
388	David	Rousell	GB12	Considers the proposals for Byfleets and Pyrford to be unacceptable. There has been no consideration with regards to local infrastructure	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 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 application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure 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.	
388	David	Rousell	GB16	Considers the proposals for Byfleets and Pyrford to be unacceptable. There has been no consideration with regards to local infrastructure	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding infrastructure, congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto the A245. The key requirements also note that improvements to pedestrian, cycle links and access to public transport will be required. The exact nature of these measures will be informed by a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
388	David	Rousell	GB4	Considers there is suitable brownfield sites available. Evidence should be made available to demonstrate this before destroying three villages. Development should be focused in towns not surrounding villages.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
388	David	Rousell	GB5	Considers there is suitable brownfield sites available. Evidence should be made available to demonstrate this before destroying three villages. Development should be focused in towns not surrounding villages.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
388	David	Rousell	GB12	Considers there is suitable brownfield sites available. Evidence should be made available to demonstrate this before destroying three villages. Development should be focused in towns not surrounding villages.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
388	David	Rousell	GB13	Considers there is suitable brownfield sites available. Evidence should be made available to demonstrate this before destroying three villages. Development should be focused in towns not surrounding villages.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
388	David	Rousell	GB15	Considers there is suitable brownfield sites available. Evidence should be made available to demonstrate this before destroying three villages. Development should be focused in towns not surrounding villages.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
388	David	Rousell	GB16	Considers there is suitable brownfield sites available. Evidence should be made available to demonstrate this before destroying three villages. Development should be focused in towns not surrounding villages.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0, 9.0, 11.0 and 16.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1367	David	Rousham	GB12	Proposals should be smaller and balanced with necessary services/facilities including community and recreational facilities	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 need 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
1367	David	Rousham	GB13	Proposals should be smaller and balanced with necessary services/facilities including community and recreational facilities	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 need 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
1367	David	Rousham	GB12	There are inadequate services/facilities to cope with the increase in need	None stated.	This representation regarding sport and recreation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, paragraph 3.7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1367	David	Rousham	GB13	There are inadequate services/facilities to cope with the increase in need	None stated.	This representation regarding sport and recreation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 3.0, paragraph 3.7	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1367	David	Rousham	GB12	A local resident that lives near the proposal sites. Objects as the surrounding road are narrow and inadequate and is already blighted by excessive traffic.	None stated.	<p>The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0</p> <p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto 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 application stage.</p> <p>The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. A Duty to Cooperate statement will be published in due course to demonstrate the extent of cooperation between the two authorities and indeed with other relevant organisations and neighbouring authorities. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work 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
1367	David	Rousham	GB13	A local resident that lives near the proposal sites. Objects as the surrounding road are narrow and inadequate and is already blighted by excessive traffic.	None stated.	The representation regarding congestion and the impact of the proposed development on the road network has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, paragraph 3.1 to 3.6; Section 20.0 and Section 24.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						<p>The various transports studies prepared by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council set out the impact the proposed site allocations will have on the strategic road network. These impacts will be mitigated by site specific measures that will be identified and comprehensively addressed through the development management process. As part of these site specific measures, the key requirements for the proposed allocation in the DPD state that the development of the site will be required to provide satisfactory vehicular access onto adjacent road. 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>	
91	Lyn	Rowden	GB5	This land is one of the few green spaces left in Byfleet. It is a buffer between the M25 and our houses and provides a vital corridor for a varied number of wildlife species.	Remove this site from the plan.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a local and regional biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development. The key requirements of the proposals will require where necessary an ecological assessment to be carried out to inform any planning decisions on the sites. The Council will ensure that any development of the proposed sites will incorporate adequate and appropriate Green Infrastructure to provide a buffer between the development and the M25.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
91	Lyn	Rowden	GB5	The local road could not cope with extra traffic and the whole of Byfleet would suffer.	Remove this site from the plan.	<p>The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The study acknowledges the traffic impacts on the A245. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The general approach to dealing with this issues is set out in detail in Sections 20 and 3 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. The Council has constructively and positively been working with the County Council in assessing the transport impacts of both the Core Strategy which the Site Allocations DPD seeks to deliver and the Site Allocations DPD itself. The two authorities have worked together to carry out the Strategic Transport Assessment (2010) to inform the Core strategy, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify the infrastructure requirements to support the Core strategy, the Transport Strategy and Programme, the Regulation 123 list which Community Infrastructure Levy will be spent and the latest Strategic Transport Assessment (2015) to support the Site Allocations DPD. It has also worked with the County Council and the other Surrey authorities to</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						prepare the Cumulative Assessment of Future Development Impacts on the Highway. Under the Duty to Cooperate the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the cross boundary implications of their proposals are assessed and appropriate mitigation introduced to address any adverse impacts. The proposals of the DPD are informed by comments from the County Council both formally and informally. The Council is committed to continue to work positively with the County Council throughout the Site Allocations DPD process and beyond to address common and strategic transport issues of the area.	
91	Lyn	Rowden	GB5	It represents a very large proportion of Byfleet's Green Belt and should be preserved for future generations.	Remove this site from the plan.	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
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB9	The area supports a variety of wildlife including buzzards, bats and other protected species. There will be increased risk to wildlife.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB10	The area supports an abundance of wildlife and a habitat for various species including buzzards. Removing GB designation and developing significant areas of open space will threaten local wildlife.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB11	The area supports an abundance of wildlife and a habitat for various species including buzzards. Removing GB designation and developing significant areas of open space will threaten local wildlife.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>Nevertheless a number of the proposed allocations will require a detailed ecological survey as a key requirement to assess and address any site specific ecological issues.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity</p>	No further modification is 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 including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.	
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB8	<p>Object to proposals for GB8 and the recent planning application for school and leisure facilities.</p> <p>Objects to the associated new leisure centre, there is no special circumstances to justify the use. There are existing facilities in other parts of Woking including Golworth Park.</p> <p>It would make sense for the running track to remain in Sheerwater, where the density is high.</p> <p>Does not consider there is sufficient pupil need for the school. A survey carried out by SCC 2014 states that the need for extra school in Woking was not urgent at this time.</p> <p>Highlights that GB boundary should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'.</p>	None stated.	The proposed Hoe Valley Free School and leisure facilities at Egley Road (GB8) has recently been granted planning permission. As part of the case put forward by the applicant for very special circumstances, it is noted in the Officer Report for the application that there is a genuine and pressing need for a secondary school in the Borough (supported by Surrey County Council as local education authority). The associated sport and leisure facilities on the site are an integral part of the operational and educational curriculum requirements of the school. In combination with the other points put forward by the applicant, the case for very special circumstances was successfully made in this instance.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB9	<p>WBC CEO is quoted promoting high density development within the Town Centre as oppose to building on green fields. This is a view shared by many residents. Woking is the smallest borough with proportionally the least GB</p>	None stated.	<p>The need for housing development within the Green Belt is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0. In summary, the Council's approach to housing delivery is to focus on high density development within the Centres to meet the housing need in the early part of the plan period, however the evidence suggests that there will be insufficient land supply to meet the need during the later phase. Hence the need for the release of some Green Belt land to address this need.</p> <p>It is true that the Borough is one of the smallest boroughs in Surrey geographically. The SHMA (2009) that informed the Core Strategy identified an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per annum (499 of this figure to be affordable housing). Taking into account the available evidence including an assessment of various options of housing provision and the requirements of the NPPF as whole the Inspector agreed that the Core Strategy should make provision for an annual average housing requirement of 292 dwellings. Over the plan period between 2010 and 2027 this equates to 4,964 dwellings.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB10	<p>WBC Chief Executive is quoted in relation to development of green fields. Concerned that Woking is one of the smallest boroughs and with the least amount of GB proportionally- therefore the loss of GB to development is disproportionate.</p>	None stated.	<p>The need for housing development within the Green Belt is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0. In summary, the Council's approach to housing delivery is to focus on high density development within the Centres to meet the housing need in the early part of the plan period, however the evidence suggests that there will be insufficient land supply to meet the need during the later phase. Hence the need for the release of some Green Belt land to address this need.</p> <p>It is true that the Borough is one of the smallest boroughs in Surrey geographically. The SHMA (2009) that informed the Core Strategy identified an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per annum (499 of this figure to be affordable housing). Taking into account the available evidence including an assessment of various options of housing provision and the requirements of the NPPF as whole the Inspector agreed that the Core Strategy should make provision for an annual average housing requirement of 292 dwellings. Over the plan period between 2010 and 2027 this equates to 4,964 dwellings.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB11	<p>WBC Chief Executive is quoted in relation to development of green fields. Concerned that Woking is one of the smallest boroughs and with the least amount of GB proportionally- therefore the loss of GB to development is disproportionate.</p>	None stated.	<p>The need for housing development within the Green Belt is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0. In summary, the Council's approach to housing delivery is to focus on high density development within the Centres to meet the housing need in the early part of the plan period, however the evidence suggests that there will be insufficient land supply to meet the need during the later phase. Hence the need for the release of some Green Belt land to address this need.</p> <p>It is true that the Borough is one of the smallest boroughs in Surrey geographically. The SHMA (2009) that informed the Core Strategy identified an objectively assessed housing need of 594 dwellings per annum (499 of this figure to be affordable housing). Taking into account the available evidence including an assessment of various options of housing provision and the requirements of the NPPF as whole the Inspector agreed that the Core Strategy should make provision for an annual average housing requirement of 292 dwellings. Over the plan period between 2010 and 2027 this equates to 4,964 dwellings.</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB9	No evidence has been produced to demonstrate that all brownfield sites have been exhausted. Object to proposal for the removal of GB land. Suggests WBC reconsider its plans	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB10	Object to the loss of GB land for development. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate all brownfield land has been exhausted first.	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB11	Object to the loss of GB land for development. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate all brownfield land has been exhausted first.	Consider brownfield sites	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9, Section 11.0 and Section 9.0, paragraph 9.2	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB9	Concerned about increases in traffic, flooding, crime and impact on the landscape and green fields. The road network is poor and the lack of pedestrian footpaths raises concerns. The proposals are unsustainable.	None stated.	The sites being proposed for allocations are supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which has considered the sites against these issues and based on the available information, the sites identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD are considered the most sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 3.0, 5.0, 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB10	The proposal is unsustainable. The increase in Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, Noise, Crime, Loss of Green fields and Escarpment Feature Poor road network.	None stated.	The sites being proposed for allocations are supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which has considered the sites against these issues and based on the available information, the sites identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD are considered the most sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 3.0, 5.0, 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB11	The proposal is unsustainable. The increase in Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, Noise, Crime, Loss of Green fields and Escarpment Feature Poor road network.	None stated.	The sites being proposed for allocations are supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which has considered the sites against these issues and based on the available information, the sites identified in the draft Site Allocation DPD are considered the most sustainable. Please also see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0. 3.0, 5.0, 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB10	The proposal goes against Government policy. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB11	The proposal goes against Government policy. One of the main purposes of the GB is to prevent urban sprawl and maintain open spaces between towns/villages. The proposals would do the opposite and remove the separation between Hook Heath, Mayford and Woking	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, 12.0 and 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1294	B.A.	Rowlan	GB9	The proposed development is contrary to Government directive that GB should be conserved. National GB policy NPPF sets out the main purposes of the GB including to check unrestricted sprawl.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, in particular paragraph 1.9, Section 15.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB8	Wildlife would be detrimentally impacted by the proposed development, particularly with the inclusion of floodlights and evening recreational facilities and the impact on bats.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and with regard to wildlife, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further policies to control noise and light pollution from development in the Council's emerging Development Management Policies DPD. Also, a key requirement for Policy GB8 states that flood lighting should be sensitively designed to minimise impact in landscape/townscape terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB9	Wildlife would be detrimentally impacted by the proposed development, particularly with the inclusion of floodlights and evening recreational facilities and the impact on bats.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and with regard to wildlife, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further policies to control noise and light pollution from development in the Council's emerging Development Management Policies DPD. Also, a key requirement for Policy GB8 states that flood lighting should be sensitively designed to minimise impact in landscape/townscape terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB10	Wildlife would be detrimentally impacted by the proposed development, particularly with the inclusion of floodlights and evening recreational facilities and the impact on bats.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and with regard to wildlife, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further policies to control noise and light pollution from development in the Council's emerging Development Management Policies DPD. Also, a key requirement for Policy GB8 states that flood lighting should be	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						sensitively designed to minimise impact in landscape/townscape terms.	
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB11	Wildlife would be detrimentally impacted by the proposed development, particularly with the inclusion of floodlights and evening recreational facilities and the impact on bats.	None stated.	The Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and with regard to wildlife, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further policies to control noise and light pollution from development in the Council's emerging Development Management Policies DPD. Also, a key requirement for Policy GB8 states that flood lighting should be sensitively designed to minimise impact in landscape/townscape terms.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB8	Objects to the removal of this site from the Green Belt. The planning application PLAN/2015/0703 to build a school and leisure facilities under special circumstances and need ground. The leisure facilities do not appear to be a special circumstance or need (the existing Leisure Centre is one and a half miles away) but a commercial enterprise hung on the back of a school. Does not believe there are sufficient pupils to support the school, which would need to be supported by pupils from further afield. A survey by Surrey County Council in 2014 stated that need for an extra school in Woking was not urgent. Therefore the exceptional circumstances needed to alter Green Belt boundaries, as per National Policy, have not been established.	None stated.	The justification for development of a school and leisure facilities is made in the report to Planning committee for planning application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which was granted permission by the Council (and was not called in by the Secretary of State). There is clear evidence of need for a secondary in the Borough over the plan period, to 2027, and it is good planning to work with partners (including the Education Authority at Surrey County Council) to ensure necessary infrastructure is available before need becomes critical.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB7	Strongly objects to the proposals.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB8	Strongly objects to the proposals. GB8 is not an extreme or even a special case.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB9	Strongly objects to the proposals.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB10	Strongly objects to the proposals.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB11	Strongly objects to the proposals.	None stated.	Objection noted. This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0 and 2.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB8	Draws attention to a quote by the Council's Chief Executive Ray Morgan 'Do people really want every field we've got built on or would they rather the intensification of the town centre' (sic). This is supported by a considerable number of people in Woking, particularly as it is one of smallest Surrey boroughs with the least amount of Green Belt.	None stated.	While the comment is noted, the Draft Site Allocations DPD was recommended for publication and consultation by the relevant Council committees. At the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0, with further relevant detail in Section 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB9	Draws attention to a quote by the Council's Chief Executive Ray Morgan 'Do people really want every field we've got built on or would they rather the intensification of the town centre' (sic). This is supported by a considerable number of people in Woking, particularly as it is one of smallest Surrey boroughs with the least amount of Green Belt.	None stated.	While the comment is noted, the Draft Site Allocations DPD was recommended for publication and consultation by the relevant Council committees. At the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0, with further relevant detail in Section 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB10	Draws attention to a quote by the Council's Chief Executive Ray Morgan 'Do people really want every field we've got built on or would they rather the intensification of the town centre' (sic). This is supported by a considerable number of people in Woking, particularly as it is one of smallest Surrey boroughs with the least amount of Green Belt.	None stated.	While the comment is noted, the Draft Site Allocations DPD was recommended for publication and consultation by the relevant Council committees. At the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0, with further relevant detail in Section 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB11	Draws attention to a quote by the Council's Chief Executive Ray Morgan 'Do people really want every field we've got built on or would they rather the intensification of the town centre' (sic). This is supported by a considerable number of people in Woking, particularly as it is one of smallest Surrey boroughs with the least amount of Green Belt.	None stated.	While the comment is noted, the Draft Site Allocations DPD was recommended for publication and consultation by the relevant Council committees. At the Executive Meeting of the Council on 4 June 2015, the Council's Monitoring Officer recommended to the Executive that the draft Site Allocations DPD met the requirements of national policy and EU Directives, and had been informed by robust evidence. The justification for the release of land from the Green Belt for development, and for safeguarding sites to meet future development need (after 2027) is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Sections 1.0 and 2.0, with further relevant detail in Section 21.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB8	The increase in Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, Noise, Crime, Loss of Green fields and Escarpment Feature are more reasons why development should not go ahead. The road system is poorly maintained and the proposals would worsen this and make the removal of the sites from the Green Belt unsustainable.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 5.0 and 7.0. In addition, 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. On noise and pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB9	The increase in Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, Noise, Crime, Loss of Green fields and Escarpment Feature are more reasons why development should not go ahead. The road system is poorly maintained and the proposals would worsen this and make the removal of the sites from the Green Belt unsustainable.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 5.0 and 7.0. In addition, 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. On noise and pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB10	The increase in Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, Noise, Crime, Loss of Green fields and Escarpment Feature are more reasons why development should not go ahead. The road system is poorly maintained and the proposals would worsen this and make the removal of the sites from the Green Belt unsustainable.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 5.0 and 7.0. In addition, 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. On noise and pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB11	The increase in Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, Noise, Crime, Loss of Green fields and Escarpment Feature are more reasons why development should not go ahead. The road system is poorly maintained and the proposals would worsen this and make the removal of the sites from the Green Belt unsustainable.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11, and Sections 5.0 and 7.0. In addition, 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. On noise and pollution, the Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design, the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD include robust policies and guidance to make sure that the design of development that will come forward on the allocated sites achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of light and noise pollution. There are further detailed policies on noise and pollution in the emerging Development Management Policies DPD, which will be examined in May 2016.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB8	The proposed development goes against the Government's national Green Belt policy and purposes of the Green Belt defined within that.	None stated.	The justification for development of a school and leisure facilities at site GB8 is made in the report to Planning committee for planning application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which was granted permission by the Council (and was not called in by the Secretary of State). Justification for development at the other sites mentioned is detailed in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB9	The proposed development goes against the Government's national Green Belt policy and purposes of the Green Belt defined within that.	None stated.	The justification for development of a school and leisure facilities at site GB8 is made in the report to Planning committee for planning application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which was granted permission by the Council (and was not called in by the Secretary of State). Justification for development at the other sites mentioned is detailed in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB10	The proposed development goes against the Government's national Green Belt policy and purposes of the Green Belt defined within that.	None stated.	The justification for development of a school and leisure facilities at site GB8 is made in the report to Planning committee for planning application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which was granted permission by the Council (and was not called in by the Secretary of State). Justification for development at the other sites mentioned is detailed in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1451	GT. A	Rowlan	GB11	The proposed development goes against the Government's national Green Belt policy and purposes of the Green Belt defined within that.	None stated.	The justification for development of a school and leisure facilities at site GB8 is made in the report to Planning committee for planning application ref PLAN/2015/0703, which was granted permission by the Council (and was not called in by the Secretary of State). Justification for development at the other sites mentioned is detailed in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1519	S.	Royston	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 need post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development need (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 need, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1519	S.	Royston	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 need post 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet the long term housing development need (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 need, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1519	S.	Royston	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
1519	S.	Royston	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

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1519	S.	Royston	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 need before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development need 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 need, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1519	S.	Royston	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 need before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development need 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 need, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1519	S.	Royston	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 need before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development need 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 need, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1519	S.	Royston	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 need before or after 2027. Unfortunately neither the representation nor the Council's evidence base provide reasonable alternative sites to meet housing development need 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 need, beyond 2027.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1519	S.	Royston	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 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
1519	S.	Royston	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	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	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				public open spaces and woodland, and destroy the character of Hook Heath and Mayford.		protected by Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt.	
1519	S.	Royston	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
1519	S.	Royston	GB11	Outlines the NPPF requirement to clearly demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances where release of land from the Green Belt is proposed. Acknowledges the need for 550 homes in the Green Belt from 2022 to 2027, but an exceptional need for 1200 or any number of homes in the Green Belt from 2027-40 is not defined or demonstrated through firm evidence.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 2.0, and for background, Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1501	Stephen, Joanne	Rush	GB12	Objects to the plans and the overall intention. While understanding that houses need to be built across the UK, the scale of development proposed is excessive and will destroy many of the positives that Pyrford has to offer, and that attracted us to the village. This includes the community atmosphere that exists only in a small village, green spaces including woodland, recreation areas and footpaths. and local pride and care for he environment and existing properties.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. They also state that development should address opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way. Detail on local landscape can be found in Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1501	Stephen, Joanne	Rush	GB13	Objects to the plans and the overall intention. While understanding that houses need to be built across the UK, the scale of development proposed is excessive and will destroy many of the positives that Pyrford has to offer, and that attracted us to the village. This includes the community atmosphere that exists only in a small village, green spaces including woodland, recreation areas and footpaths. and local pride and care for he environment and existing properties.	None stated.	The landscape and townscape character of Pyrford is acknowledged and well documented in the Heritage of Woking and Woking Character Study. The proposed allocations in Pyrford are not intended to turn Pyrford into a town. It is envisaged that planning to meet local housing need should not undermine the overall social fabric of the area. There is no doubt that the development of the sites will increase the population of Pyrford. However, it is expected that development will be supported by adequate infrastructure (as outlined in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, Section 3.0) to minimise any social, environmental and infrastructure pressures in the area as a result of the development. Development will also be built to high environmental and design standards in accordance with the environmental and climate change requirements of the Core Strategy. Overall, the Council is satisfied that the social, environmental and economic character of the area will not be significantly undermined. The key requirements for the site note that the site must provide open space and include improvements or new green infrastructure. They also state that development should address opportunities for pedestrian and cycle ways through the site. This will account for established footpaths, especially if these are public rights of way. Detail on local landscape can be found in Section 7.0 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1501	Stephen, Joanne	Rush	GB12	Objects on the basis of the increase in traffic that additional housing will cause, on top of existing congestion at particular times of day. There is already more traffic due to the expanding local primary school which has not been accompanied by comprehensive road planning. Traffic increases will lead to increased danger for drivers, riders and pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1501	Stephen, Joanne	Rush	GB13	Objects on the basis of the increase in traffic that additional housing will cause, on top of existing congestion at particular times of day. There is already more traffic due to the expanding local primary school which has not been accompanied by comprehensive road planning. Traffic increases will lead to increased danger for drivers, riders and pedestrians.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1501	Stephen, Joanne	Rush	GB12	Understands that Pyrford will grow and houses will be built, but investment in infrastructure is needed before such development is considered. The number and placing of new properties should be considered, to ensure it does not impact on this beautiful and charming village for existing residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 7.0 (paragraph 7.4), 21.0 and 23.0 .	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1501	Stephen, Joanne	Rush	GB13	Understands that Pyrford will grow and houses will be built, but investment in infrastructure is needed before such development is considered. The number and placing of new properties should be considered, to ensure it does not impact on this beautiful and charming village for existing residents.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 3.0, 7.0 (paragraph 7.4), 21.0 and 23.0 .	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
859	D E	Russell	GB7	Ten Acre farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, an SSSI, used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present site of five caravans would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and also increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of 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 ground. 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
859	D E	Russell	GB7	Strongly object to increasing the number of Traveller pitches on this land. Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough. Mayford already a major contribution to 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
859	D E	Russell	GB8	Strong object to housing on the site. Will fill in green space between Mayford and Woking and risk Woking and Guildford merging, against the purpose of the Green Belt. Will turn Mayford into a suburb of Woking, no consideration for the character and preserving Mayford as a separate village settlement.	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
859	D E	Russell	GB9	Strong object to housing on the site. Will fill in green space between Mayford and Woking and risk Woking and Guildford merging, against the purpose of the Green Belt. Will turn Mayford into a suburb of Woking, no consideration for the character and preserving Mayford as a separate village settlement.	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
859	D E	Russell	GB10	Strong object to housing on the site. Will fill in green space between Mayford and Woking and risk Woking and Guildford merging, against the purpose of the Green Belt. Will turn Mayford into a suburb of Woking, no consideration for the character and preserving Mayford as a separate village settlement.	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
859	D E	Russell	GB11	Strong object to housing on the site. Will fill in green space between Mayford and Woking and risk Woking and Guildford merging, against the purpose of the Green Belt. Will turn Mayford into a suburb of Woking, no consideration for the character and preserving Mayford as a separate village settlement.	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
859	D E	Russell	GB8	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
859	D E	Russell	GB9	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
859	D E	Russell	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>	No further modification is 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).	
859	D E	Russell	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
859	D E	Russell	GB7	Previously 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
859	D E	Russell	GB8	Please reconsider your plans as what is planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the UK and mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who also represents 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> <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
859	D E	Russell	GB9	Please reconsider your plans as what is planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the UK and mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who also represents 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> <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
859	D E	Russell	GB10	Please reconsider your plans as what is planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the UK and mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who also represents 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> <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
859	D E	Russell	GB11	Please reconsider your plans as what is planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the UK and mentioned in the Doomsday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who also represents 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> <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
859	D E	Russell	GB8	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston Station but there are no pavements.		The Council will draw the County Council's attention to this representation regarding unlit pedestrian footpaths to see what can be done to address the existing situation. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	of this representation
859	D E	Russell	GB9	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston 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
859	D E	Russell	GB10	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston 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
859	D E	Russell	GB11	No consideration how a larger population will impact infrastructure, including road, lack of pavements, railway bridges and traffic on Egley Road. Prey Heath Road will become dangerous as more people access Worpleston 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
864	E M	Russell	GB7	Adjacent to Smarts Heath SSSI which is used by residents for leisure purposes. Increased pitches would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area. Increased risk to wildlife due to increased domestic animals.	None stated.	Ten Acre Farm is already a functional established Traveller site. The Council is satisfied the intensification of the use of the site to include by an additional 12 pitches will not have significant adverse impacts on nearby designated sites that cannot be adequately mitigated by the key requirements of the allocation. The Council has consulted with Natural England and no objection has been raised over the expansion of the site and its impact on the SSSI. In addition, the Council has been working in partnership with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey districts and boroughs over time to prepare a detailed Borough-wide Landscape Character Assessment. There is nothing in the document that would have led the Council to different conclusions about the selection of Ten Acre Farm for expansion on landscape ground. The Landscape Character Assessment is available on the Council's website. There are robust Development Plan policies and a Design SPD to make sure that any proposal for the development of Ten Acre Farm takes a sensitive design approach to ensure any adverse impacts on the character and landscape of the immediate area are suitably mitigated. The site will continue to remain within the Green Belt and Green Belt policies will continue to apply in addition to design guidance and Core Strategy Policy CS21: Design. The Council will continue to work with the operators of the site and local stakeholders to ensure an effective management of the operations on and of the site, including the control of domestic animals. The ecological significance of the SSSI will continue to be conserved and taken into account in the consideration of any development that could have potential impacts on its ecological integrity.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
864	E M	Russell	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
864	E M	Russell	GB8	Object to proposed housing on all Mayford sites. Would turn Mayford Village into a suburb of Woking, no consideration has been made to preserve the village as a separate area. Risks merging Woking and Guildford, which is against the purpose of the Green Belt. Development will change 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
864	E M	Russell	GB9	Object to proposed housing on all Mayford sites. Would turn Mayford Village into a suburb of Woking, no consideration has been made to preserve the village 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 area. Risks merging Woking and Guildford, which is against the purpose of the Green Belt. Development will change 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.	
864	E M	Russell	GB10	Object to proposed housing on all Mayford sites. Would turn Mayford Village into a suburb of Woking, no consideration has been made to preserve the village as a separate area. Risks merging Woking and Guildford, which is against the purpose of the Green Belt. Development will change 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
864	E M	Russell	GB11	Object to proposed housing on all Mayford sites. Would turn Mayford Village into a suburb of Woking, no consideration has been made to preserve the village as a separate area. Risks merging Woking and Guildford, which is against the purpose of the Green Belt. Development will change 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
864	E M	Russell	GB8	Development will change the character of the village. An increase in population will strain the transport infrastructure and lead to gridlock. The road and pavement network is inadequate and there are no plans to upgrade. There are no pavements on Prey Heath Road, leading to safety concerns if traffic to Worplesden Station increases.	None stated.	This representation 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
864	E M	Russell	GB9	Development will change the character of the village. An increase in population will strain the transport infrastructure and lead to gridlock. The road and pavement network is inadequate and there are no plans to upgrade. There are no pavements on Prey Heath Road, leading to safety concerns if traffic to Worplesden Station increases.	None stated.	This representation 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
864	E M	Russell	GB10	Development will change the character of the village. An increase in population will strain the transport infrastructure and lead to gridlock. The road and pavement network is inadequate and there are no plans to upgrade. There are no pavements on Prey Heath Road, leading to safety concerns if traffic to Worplesden Station increases.	None stated.	This representation 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
864	E M	Russell	GB11	Development will change the character of the village. An increase in population will strain the transport infrastructure and lead to gridlock. The road and pavement network is inadequate and there are no plans to upgrade. There are no pavements on Prey Heath Road, leading to safety concerns if traffic to Worplesden Station increases.	None stated.	This representation 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
864	E M	Russell	GB8	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a historical village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
864	E M	Russell	GB9	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a historical village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
864	E M	Russell	GB10	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a historical village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
864	E M	Russell	GB11	Please reconsider the plans as it will have a devastating impact on Mayford as a historical village. Mayford is unique and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 23.0. In addition, the Council recognise the special character of Mayford. Core Strategy Policy CS6: Green Belt specifically highlights that development will not be allowed if it will have an unacceptable effect on the primarily residential character of the village and Green Belt. The response to the Mayford Village Society can be found under Representor ID 563.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
864	E M	Russell	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
864	E M	Russell	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. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in 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
864	E M	Russell	GB9	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity 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	No further modification is 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).	
864	E M	Russell	GB10	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
864	E M	Russell	GB11	Wildlife will be wiped out on the site whilst there will be an increased risk to wildlife in protected Heathlands due to the proximity of the development.	None stated.	<p>During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites and wider area. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features that could not be addressed.</p> <p>The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage new development to make positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces and the creation of linkages between sites to create a biodiversity network of wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. This is clearly set out in Core Strategy Policy CS7: Biodiversity and nature conservation. In addition to this the Council will consult with the relevant biodiversity organisations including Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England during the detailed planning application stage as well as require applicants to carry out prior assessments of the site to provide information on species and habitats, as set out in the site specific Key Requirements. This will ensure the effective avoidance and/or mitigation of any adverse effects prior to approval of the development.</p> <p>None of the proposed allocated sites are within 400m of the SPAs. The Council has robust policies, in particular Policy CS8 and an Avoidance Strategy, to make sure that development avoids harms to the SPAs. This includes securing developer contributions towards providing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).</p>	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1359	Robert	Russell	General	Objects to proposals that would result in the change in GB boundaries- it should not be allowed.	None stated.	This representation regarding the release of Green Belt land to meet future housing need has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 1.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1359	Robert	Russell	GB4	Support.	None stated.	The support is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1359	Robert	Russell	GB17	Support	None stated.	The support is noted	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1359	Robert	Russell	General	The documents are difficult to understand. Suggests that the questionnaire is simplified.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper Section 6.0. The Council will consider whether improvements can be made to the questionnaire at the following round of consultation.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1359	Robert	Russell	GB5	The land is part of the village green and should be retained	Use of derelict old Manor	The Old Manor School site was assessed through the SHLAA (SHLAABY064) and the Sustainability Appraisal. Although the site is known to be vacant, its former use was as a school and therefore the redevelopment of the site would result in the loss of a community	No further modification is proposed as a result

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					school site for housing	<p>facility and would need to be justified.</p> <p>At the time of preparing the SHLAA the landowner had not indicated whether current community use was surplus to requirements and whether the site was available, therefore the site was not considered developable or deliverable. (please see the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 13.0)</p> <p>Nevertheless, the SHLAA calculated the potential quantum of housing that could be accommodated on the site, this alone would not be sufficient to replace the potential yield on site GB5.</p>	of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	With reference to no. 9, an ecology assessment and tree survey were carried out as part of the planning application, which was not turned down on these grounds. Suggest mitigation measures as listed.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	We recommend that GB5 is renamed to more accurately reflect its location ; the TAA is revisited and errors corrected to allow for critical assessment; SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation; the site at Five Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further ; and that Ten Acres Farm (GB7) is removed as an allocation .	<p>That GB5 is renamed to more accurately reflect its location</p> <p>The TAA is revisited and errors corrected in order to allow for critical assessment</p> <p>That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation</p> <p>That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further</p> <p>That Ten Acres Farm (GB7) is removed as an allocation</p>	The general approach to meeting the accommodation need of Travellers is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The representation to rename site GB5 is noted. The Council has assessed the land south of Murrays Lane and the approach taken by the Council will not support its allocation. The Council has identified sufficient land to meet the accommodation need of Travellers and Ten Acre Farm and Five Acres will make a significant contribution towards that.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	With reference to no. 10, as the Green Belt review notes, this is not an important piece of Green Belt land. Landscape harm can be mitigated through suitable conditions. There may be adverse impacts on trees protected by a TPO zone, any such affect would need to be mitigated.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	The Council has identified the most sustainable sites when compared against other reasonable alternatives to meets its identified need. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The assessment of the alternative looked at each site against a range of sustainability objectives. The combined evidence base does not support the allocation of this site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The sustainability appraisal acknowledges many of the positive aspects of the proposed site, but is significantly flawed as it has failed to take account of the previous assessment of the planning application. The site should be re scored.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The Sustainability Appraisals comments in relation to no. 11 are confusing. The same factors are positively and negatively weighed. Suggest optimising/mitigating measures: design of the development to have regard to incorporation of Su and other adaptation measures, to reduce surface water flood risk.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	The Council does not see any inconsistency in the scores for objective 11. There is a neutral score for the short, medium and long term. As a matter of policy, Su would be required if it is considered relevant to address flood risk at the site. However, the principle of developing the site for the proposed use has to be established first. The Council have decided that the site should not be allocated as a Traveller site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	Planning policy requires development to have a positive impact upon this objective to sustainably use and re-use renewable and non-renewable resources. The climate change SPD encourages developers to use locally sourced materials to minimise impacts.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	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
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The Council has effective measures, policies and guidance in place to reduce the amount of household and trade waste that is generated development. Optimising measures suggested.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	There are no Groundwater Source Protection Zones and the site is located near to but not immediately adjacent to the Borough boundary so unlikely to affect zones in neighbouring boroughs).	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the	The manner in which that Council has sought to meet the need of Travellers is addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				Optimising/mitigating measures suggested.	south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation		
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB2	Problematic to focusing the majority of new pitches in Woking on this site - overdevelopment and it concentrates Traveller accommodation into a single site. This would be inconsistent with national policy which seeks to integrate Traveller sites and the local community, ensuring sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	The approach to meeting the accommodation need of Traveller is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB3	Problematic to focusing the majority of new pitches in Woking on this site - overdevelopment and it concentrates Traveller accommodation into a single site. This would be inconsistent with national policy which seeks to integrate Traveller sites and the local community, ensuring sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	The approach to meeting the accommodation need of Traveller is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	With reference to sustainability appraisal objective 15, the distance to services need to be seen in the context of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). In our experience of dealing with almost solely Gypsy and Traveller cases, this is an exceptionally sustainable site and this should be given weight accordingly. Suggested o Optimising/mitigating measures: contribute to the provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the development of the site, in addition to the relevant CIL contribution.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	The manner in which that Council has sought to meet the need of Travellers is addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB2	Overcrowding - to make room for additional pitches the site has already been reconfigured/subdivided, reducing the amount of amenity space. Additional development would be unacceptably detrimental.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	This matter has been 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
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB3	Overcrowding - to make room for additional pitches the site has already been reconfigured/subdivided, reducing the amount of amenity space. Additional development would be unacceptably detrimental.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	This matter has been 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
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB3	The DPD proposes to infill/intensify with an additional 10 permanent pitches and a transit site; in excess of 25 pitches. The Green Belt review, Sustainability Appraisal and previous planning applications all dealt with this site as one development. Only now the LPA chooses to divide the site, only justified as there are two landowners. This is entirely unacceptable; aside from making temporary permissions	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not	This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
				permanent, leave the site as it is.	expanded further		
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB2	The DPD proposes to infill/intensify with an additional 10 permanent pitches and a transit site; in excess of 25 pitches. The Green Belt review, Sustainability Appraisal and previous planning applications all dealt with this site as one development. Only now the LPA chooses to divide the site, only justified as there are two landowners. This is entirely unacceptable; aside from making temporary permissions permanent, leave the site as it is.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. It is proposed to allocate the site as a single site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB7	This site has three pitches for a single extended family. The Council understands the site would be available. Ruston Planning Limited has received information suggesting this site is not available. This is supported by the findings of the Green Belt Review which rejected the site for that reason. Ten Acres Farm cannot be considered deliverable and cannot contribute to future site allocations.	That Ten Acres Farm (GB7) is removed as an allocation	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
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The site would bring about positive impact on health and wellbeing (sustainability appraisal objective) via providing decent homes (pitches). The site is within walking distance of the health centre in West Byfleet.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives. SA Report provides evidence.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB2	Problematic to focusing the majority of new pitches in Woking on this site - overdevelopment and it concentrates Traveller accommodation into a single site. This would be inconsistent with national policy which seeks to integrate Traveller sites and the local community, ensuring sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	The approach to meeting the accommodation need of Traveller is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB3	Problematic to focusing the majority of new pitches in Woking on this site - overdevelopment and it concentrates Traveller accommodation into a single site. This would be inconsistent with national policy which seeks to integrate Traveller sites and the local community, ensuring sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	The approach to meeting the accommodation need of Traveller is comprehensively addressed in Section 4 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. 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 need when compared against other alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB3	Overcrowding - to make room for additional pitches the site has already been reconfigured/subdivided, reducing the amount of amenity space. Additional development would be unacceptably detrimental. The DPD proposes to infill/intensify with an additional 10 permanent pitches and a transit site; in excess of 25 pitches. The Green Belt review, Sustainability Appraisal and previous planning applications all dealt with this site as one development. Only now the LPA chooses to divide the site, only justified as there are two landowners. This is entirely unacceptable; aside from making temporary permissions permanent, leave the site as it is.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB2	Overcrowding - to make room for additional pitches the site has already been reconfigured/subdivided, reducing the amount of amenity space. Additional development would be unacceptably detrimental. The DPD proposes to infill/intensify with an additional 10 permanent pitches and a transit site; in excess of 25 pitches. The Green Belt review, Sustainability Appraisal and previous planning applications all dealt with this site as one development. Only now the LPA chooses to divide the site, only justified as there are two landowners. This is entirely unacceptable; aside from making temporary permissions permanent, leave the site as it is.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	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
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	Any proposal for development can be situated in Flood Zone 1, so there should be no objection on these ground.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB7	This site has three pitches for a single extended family. The Council understands the site would be available. Ruston Planning Limited has received information suggesting this site is not available. This is supported by the findings of the Green Belt Review which rejected the site for that reason. Ten Acres Farm cannot be considered deliverable and cannot contribute to future site allocations.	That Ten Acres Farm (GB7) is removed as an allocation	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
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The comments in respect of the site under sustainability appraisal objective 4 (Reduce poverty, crime and social exclusion) fail to acknowledge that provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches is combating social exclusion in terms of the lack of suitable accommodation nationally, regionally and locally.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The site is outside of the Local Centre but is within reasonable walking distance of key services and facilities, hence the need to travel to access services and facilities will be reduced and these would be supported.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The site is open land within the Green Belt, its development impacts on objective 6 (Make the best use of previously developed land and existing buildings) are predicted to be neutral.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
					forward as an allocation		
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The site is not problematic in terms of noise or air pollution. An AQMA designation is more likely. Close proximity to Byfleet Local Centre should be weighed in the sustainability report against this, to give a neutral score. Suggested optimising/mitigating measures: Design of development to include mitigation measures to reduce exposure to air and noise pollution.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	With reference to no. 8, no issues were raised with regard to contaminated land during the planning application process. Suggested optimising / mitigating measures: further investigation into contaminated land, in consultation with the Environment Agency and Environmental Health.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	Consider the site would contribute positively in terms of the Sustainability Appraisal's housing objective, given the site's potential to assist in providing specialist accommodation to meet an identified need.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The previous application was not refused for either noise or air pollution reasons; the LPA has already accepted through the planning process that these issues are capable of mitigation. This should have been taken into account in the sustainability appraisal. Overall the sustainability appraisal should find a positive score. Suggested optimising/mitigating measures: Improvements to open space for recreation ; Improvements to cycling and pedestrian access to Byfleet Local Centre and surrounding GI ; Measures to mitigate air/noise pollution impacts.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	We have identified a number of issues with the draft DPD and recommend: the TAA is revisited and errors corrected in order to allow for critical assessment; the proposed site (at Murrays Lane) is included in the DPD as an allocation ; that the site at Five Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further; that Ten Acres Farm (GB7) is removed as an allocation.	The TAA is revisited and errors corrected in order to allow for critical assessment That proposed site is included in the DPD as an allocation	The Council is satisfied that the TAA is sufficiently robust to provide appropriate basis for planning to meet the future need of Travellers. It is important that the Council plans to meet the need identified and the DPD seeks to do that. The Core Strategy commits the Council to identify sites to meet the need through the Site Allocations DPD. The approach taken is in accordance with national policy. The use of Green Belt land and the approach taken to meet the need 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
					<p>That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further</p> <p>That Ten Acres Farm (GB7) is removed as an allocation</p>		
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	Harm to the Green Belt would be limited due to the small scale of development, and when weighed against the objectives for the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 82 of the NPPF and taking into account development which could be undertaken as permitted development.	That proposed site is included in the DPD as an allocation	The Council has identified the most sustainable sites when compared against other reasonable alternatives to meet its identified need. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The assessment of the alternative looked at each site against a range of sustainability objectives. The combined evidence base does not support the allocation of this site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	This submission is in support of the site land south of Gabriel Cottage, Blanchard's Hill, Sutton Green, Woking, Surrey, GU4 7QP, not currently included as an allocation.	That proposed site is included in the DPD as an allocation	The general approach to meeting the accommodation need of Travellers 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
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	These submissions are in support of the site south of Murray's Lane identified by the Council as SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE. Note that there is also an identified site (GB5) of the same name, suggest the later is renamed to avoid confusion.	That GB5 is renamed to more accurately reflect its location	The confusion that the names of the sites causes has been noted.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB5	These submissions are in support of the site south of Murray's Lane identified by the Council as SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE. Note that there is also an identified site (GB5) of the same name, suggest the later is renamed to avoid confusion.	None stated.	The Council does not seek to allocate this land for development in the Site Allocations DPD. The confusion in the naming of the sites will be resolved.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The site would still allow for a significant amount of open space, meaning that there is sufficient space for outdoor activities for residents. This is contrary to the draft sustainability appraisal report, which comments that the quality of the recreation land to the east comprising Sanway Road 'informal kick-about area' and playground is limited.	That SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives. SA Report provides evidence.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	No objection was made by the National Grid to the previous planning application on the land. Potential exposure to air and noise pollution from the M25 could increase health inequalities - mitigation measures would be required to minimise adverse impacts.	That SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives. SA Report provides evidence.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	We propose one Gypsy/Traveller pitch to include a mobile home, touring caravan and parking. Hartanding would be rolled stone, a permeable surface. Site configuration is as illustrated. Access via a short tarmac driveway. The site is well screened, new planting of native species is proposed to infill existing gaps and maintained. 4m wide gates will be set back from the existing southern hedge and public highway.	That proposed site is included in the DPD as an allocation	The general approach to meeting the accommodation need of Travellers is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Gabriel Cottage is not considered for allocation for the reasons set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB3	Site GB2 has permanent planning permission for one pitch and temporary permission for two additional pitches. GB3 has permanent permission for four pitches. These sites are unsuitable because they comprise a broader cumulative site including 'Small Acres' and 'Five Acres Plot 1'.The officer report for PLAN/2013/0062) cites best practice of a limit of 15 pitches per site. Even this is at the upper threshold of what is recommended (15 pitches). The Green Belt Review concluded the same, rejecting the site. The site is not suitable for further intensification or expansion.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB2	Site GB2 has permanent planning permission for one pitch and temporary permission for two additional pitches. GB3 has permanent permission for four pitches. These sites are unsuitable because they comprise a broader cumulative site including 'Small Acres' and 'Five Acres Plot 1'.The officer report for PLAN/2013/0062) cites best practice of a limit of 15 pitches per site. Even this is at the upper threshold of what is recommended (15 pitches). The Green Belt Review concluded the same, rejecting the site. The site is not suitable for further intensification or expansion.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	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
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB3	Site GB2 has permanent planning permission for one pitch and temporary permission for two additional pitches. GB3 has permanent permission for four pitches. These sites are unsuitable because they comprise a broader cumulative site including 'Small Acres' and 'Five Acres Plot 1'.The officer report for PLAN/2013/0062) cites best practice of a limit of 15 pitches per site. Even this is at the upper threshold of what is recommended (15 pitches). The Green Belt Review concluded the same, rejecting the site. The site is not suitable for further intensification or expansion.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	This issue is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matter Topic Paper. See Section 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	GB2	Site GB2 has permanent planning permission for one pitch and temporary permission for two additional pitches. GB3 has permanent permission for four pitches. These sites are unsuitable because they comprise a broader cumulative site including 'Small Acres' and 'Five Acres Plot 1'.The officer report for PLAN/2013/0062) cites best practice of a limit of 15 pitches per site. Even this is at the upper threshold of what is recommended (15 pitches). The Green Belt Review concluded the same, rejecting the site. The site is not suitable for further intensification or expansion.	That the site at 5 Acres (GB2 / GB3) has the temporary pitches made permanent, but is not expanded further	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
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA 2013) identifies a need for 19 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches between 2012-2027. We do not take issue with the identification of unmet need but the TAA is not robust. Table 8 'Demand and Supply of Pitches' is unclear, incalculable and so difficult to critically assess, contrary to Government guidance.	The TAA is revisited and errors corrected in order to allow for critical assessment	The Council is satisfied that the TAA is sufficiently robust to provide appropriate basis for planning to meet the future need of Travellers. It is important that the Council plans to meet the need identified and the DPD seeks to do that. The Core Strategy commits the Council to identify sites to meet the need through the Site Allocations DPD. The approach taken is in accordance with national policy. The use of Green Belt land to meet the need 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
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA 2013) identifies a need for 19 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches between 2012-2027. We do not take issue with the identification of unmet need but the TAA is not robust. Table 8 'Demand and Supply of Pitches' is unclear, incalculable and so difficult to critically	The TAA is revisited and errors corrected in order to allow for critical	The Council is satisfied that the TAA is sufficiently robust to provide appropriate basis for planning to meet the future need of Travellers. It is important that the Council plans to meet the need identified and the DPD seeks to do that. The Core Strategy commits the Council to identify sites to meet the need through the Site Allocations DPD. The approach taken is in accordance with national policy. The use of Green Belt land to meet the need 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
				assess, contrary to Government guidance. The TAA does not demonstrate that the assessment process has been conducted properly and fairly, giving details of the methodology used to ascertain levels of need.	assessment		
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	No issue was raised with regard to the potential need to relocate or move the cable underground during the planning application.	That SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	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
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	The omission of Gabriel Cottage, Blanchards Hill, Sutton Green is surprising. Planning history of the site: applications and appeals for bungalows in 1963/1964 and 1999.; application for an agricultural bungalow in 2003; site developed as private single-pitch Gypsy site (2004), subject to enforcement action and an appeal (2005); permission sought for a single Gypsy/Traveller pitch in 2013 (PLAN/2013/113) but was refused; revised application recently resubmitted. The site is a small rectangular land parcel of land of 0.04 hectares, largely surrounded by trees and hedges. It lies at the end of a small cluster of residential properties, adjoining agricultural fields. This is 120m north of Jacobs Well, in 3km of the centre of Guildford, situated on the edge of the Green Belt, adjacent to a conservation area, and on the edge of the 400m exclusion zone around the Thames Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The latter was addressed in the previous application; the LPA concluded that development would have no significant effect on the SPA.	That proposed site is included in the DPD as an allocation	The general approach to meeting the accommodation need of Travellers is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. Gabriel Cottage is not considered for allocation for the reasons set out in the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	It is surprising the proposed site (SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE) was not included as a site allocation. The Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal for this site were mostly favourable. See site WOK001 in 6.4.11, 6.4.12, Appendix F, of the Green Belt review. It is clear that that the site is one which would only cause very limited harm, and mitigation measures are suggested.	That SITE/0073/BYFL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	The Council has identified the most sustainable sites when compared against other reasonable alternatives to meet its identified need. This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. The assessment of the alternative looked at each site against a range of sustainability objectives. The combined evidence base does not support the allocation of this site.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1153	Simon	Ruston	DNSITE	The site also conforms with the criteria set out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which is intended to provide a basis from which local plan policies are devised so is to be referred to in decision making. There is no reason as to why the site should not enjoy a peaceful co-existence with the local community. It offers regular access to local GP and dental health services and is well located for access to schools. It would provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment. The site is situated within Flood Zone 1, not at high risk. This compliance should be given considerable weight in the decision-making process.	That proposed site is included in the DPD as an allocation	The manner in which that Council has sought to meet the need of Travellers is addressed comprehensively in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 4. On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
1153	Simon	Ruston	General	There are various heritage assets nearby: Pipers Hill (Area of High Archaeological Potential), St Mary's Church and Graveyard (Grade I listed building, Area of High Archaeological Potential). Visual impacts of development would be limited. Development would bring potential to retain and improve access to the natural environment through improved public footpath link to the canal. Long distance views precluded by the M25 and screening. Suggested optimising/mitigating measures listed.	That SITE/0073/BY FL, SHLAABY073: Land to the south of Murrays Lane, Byfleet, KT14 7NE is brought forward as an allocation	On balance, based on the available information, the site is not considered appropriate to contribute towards meeting the housing need of the area when measured against all other reasonable alternatives. The manner in which the Council has approached the identification of Traveller 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
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Keep Green Belt for the purpose it was intended for. To protect the countryside, wildlife and for future generations	None stated.	The justification for releasing Green Land for development and to meet the accommodation need for Travellers has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Sections 1, 2 and 4.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Concerned about increased crime	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Concerned about increased noise	None stated.	There is no evidence that the proposals will lead to increase in crime.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Concerned about increased traffic	None stated.	The traffic implications of the proposals is comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 20. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, as part of Transport for Woking, the Council is working with the relevant operators and providers to see how best they can collectively enhance existing operational deficiencies in service provision to meet the increasing demand. The Council is also working with interested parties such as Network Rail, Enterprise M3 and the County Council to ensure that there is future investment to deliver the necessary public transport infrastructure to meet the projected demand on the back of the Core Strategy. The Council believes that the combination of the above will help address the traffic impacts of the proposals and reduce road safety and health concerns. It is also important to note that the Council continue to work with the County Council and other stakeholders to help address existing deficiencies on the network.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Concerned about loss of arable and amenity land	None stated.	Based on the available evidence it is not expected that the proposal will affect the most versatile agricultural land in the area. The Council has assessed the sensitivity of the landscape of the sites to accommodate the proposals. Based on the evidence as explained in detail in Section 7 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper, the landscape character of the area will not be significantly affected. The proposals will not adversely impact on designated open spaces.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Concerned about increased pollution	None stated.	The Council recognises the impact of traffic on pollution and has ensured that the traffic impacts of the proposals are fully assessed. The Council has carried out a revised Green Belt Boundary Review Sensitivity Test – Strategic Transport Assessment (TA) (2015) to assess the transport implications of the allocated sites. The TA acknowledges that there will be a net but marginal increase in traffic over and above the existing situation, which could be mitigated to enable the delivery of the proposed allocated sites. The mitigation measures will comprise both strategic schemes to be funded by developer contributions and other sources of funding and by site specific measures to be determined as part of detailed Transport Assessments to support planning applications. Specific requirements have been incorporated in the relevant proposed allocations to make sure that development impacts are fully assessed and appropriate site specific measures are identified to address any adverse impacts. The Council is working with the County Council to identify the strategic schemes. This will also be used to inform the future review of the IDP and the Transport Strategy and Programme. The County Council as Highway Authority for the area is satisfied that the approach to mitigation taken by the Council will	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
						minimise any adverse traffic impacts of the DPD to enable development to be acceptable in transport terms. In addition, the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Policies DPD contains robust policies to make sure the development impacts on pollution are appropriately controlled.	
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Suggests consideration of other brownfield sites	Consider alternative brownfield sites	The Council has carried out an assessment of the capacity of brownfield sites in the urban area to meet the development need of the area. There is not enough brownfield land to meet development need over the entire plan period. This matter is comprehensively addressed in Section 11 of the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. The justification for the release of Green Belt land to meet development need is addressed in detail in Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Issues and Matters Topic Paper.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
245	T V	Ryan	GB8	Concerned about loss of wildlife	None stated.	During the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD the Council consulted with Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England to discover the biodiversity value of each of the proposed sites. Overall the preferred sites did not raise any objection from Surrey Wildlife Trust or Natural England based on existing biodiversity features. The Council is committed to conserving and protecting existing biodiversity assets within the Borough. Outside of designated important sites and habitats, the Council will encourage 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
1312	Paul	Ryder	General	KCS acknowledges that the proposed redevelopment Kingfield and relocation of other sites is subject to all necessary planning consents. They would seek an appropriate alternative site and work with key stakeholders to ensure that proposals are appropriate to planning and represent the wider interests of the whole community.	None stated.	This is noted. The representation provides supporting information for the site, this has been addressed above.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1312	Paul	Ryder	General	KCS owns the freehold land off Kingsfield Rd that currently comprises: 1. Woking Football Club (WFC) 2. Woking Gymnastics Club (WGC) 3. Woking Snooker Club (WSC) Proposes that the site be considered in the Site Allocation DPD. The site is not currently viable in its existing location despite several attempts over the years.	None stated.	The representation did not provide any specific details regarding the area of land to be considered by the Council. The site is within the urban area and the Council would encourage the representor to provide further supporting information for the site, including the site boundary. The Council will consider any further information or site specific details that the representor wishes to present during the Regulation 19 consultation of the Site Allocations DPD.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
1312	Paul	Ryder	General	The existing site requires significant investment for it to be viable. To enable WFC to achieve a purpose built, self-sustainable facilities in keeping with National Football league the re-development of Kingfield site for residential purposes could help to finance this. This would also enable larger facilities to meet the need of WGC and its aspiration to become a national centre of excellence.	None stated.	The representation provides supporting information for the site, this has been addressed above.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB10	Objects to removing sites form the Green Belt. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB11	Objects to removing sites form the Green Belt. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB14	Objects to removing sites form the Green Belt. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB10	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation

Rep ID	Name	Surname	Section of DPD	Summary Of Comment	Proposal Modifications	Officer Response	Officer Proposed Modifications
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB11	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB14	The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	This representation has been addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0, in particular paragraph 3.6 and 3.11. Regarding the allocated sites, the Council will ensure that any specific scheme that comes forward, there is easy access to and within the site by all sustainable modes of travel including walking, cycling and public transport where feasible.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB10	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated as required by the NPPF. Accepts it may be sensible to look ahead past the current Core Strategy the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and WBC has not demonstrated any housing figure need or exceptional circumstances post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB11	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated as required by the NPPF. Accepts it may be sensible to look ahead past the current Core Strategy the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and WBC has not demonstrated any housing figure need or exceptional circumstances post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB14	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated as required by the NPPF. Accepts it may be sensible to look ahead past the current Core Strategy the exceptional circumstances rule still applies and WBC has not demonstrated any housing figure need or exceptional circumstances post 2027.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 1.0, paragraph 1.9-1.12 and Section 2.0	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	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. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	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. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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 need of local people.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	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. The road network is at capacity and further development will make the situation worse.	None stated.	The existing shops in Mayford form the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre which caters for the everyday need of those living locally. The proposed allocations set around Mayford would inevitably increase the number of people living locally, placing a greater demand on the shops and services currently offered in the Neighbourhood Centre. The proposed allocation at Egley Road Garden Centre (GB9) notes that there is an opportunity to provide an element of retail/community development to enhance the rather dispersed provision currently in the Mayford area. It is envisaged that this relevantly small provision of retail and/or community development will meet the day to day need 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	No further modification is 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 need of local people.	
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB10	Housing densities much higher than the surrounding densities. Will potentially have a significant impact on areas surrounding the proposed development areas. Will put greater strain on the transport infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB11	Housing densities much higher than the surrounding densities. Will potentially have a significant impact on areas surrounding the proposed development areas. Will put greater strain on the transport infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB14	Housing densities much higher than the surrounding densities. Will potentially have a significant impact on areas surrounding the proposed development areas. Will put greater strain on the transport infrastructure.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 3.0 and Section 18.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB10	Will increase urban sprawl and built on land separating Hook heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB11	Will increase urban sprawl and built on land separating Hook heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation
948	Simon	Ryeland	GB14	Will increase urban sprawl and built on land separating Hook heath from Mayford and Mayford from Woking, against the purpose of the Green Belt.	None stated.	This representation has been comprehensively addressed in the Council's Issues and Matters Topic Paper. See Section 12.0 and Section 15.0.	No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation