



# Schedule of Consultation Responses



Woking Local Development Framework  
January 2006





**SCHEDULE OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES**  
**WOKING LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**  
**CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**JANUARY 2006**

Head of Policy and Performance  
Woking Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
Gloucester Square  
Woking  
Surrey GU21 6YL

[www.woking.gov.uk](http://www.woking.gov.uk)  
01483 743871

## **Introduction**

The Council consulted on its Local Development Framework Core Strategy Issues and Options in June and July 2005. The leaflet "Fast forward ten years" set out four possible options for future development in the Borough to meet the needs of the local population. It was distributed throughout the Borough and to all members of the Council's Citizens Panel.

In addition a full Core Strategy Issues and Options report was sent to over 250 organisations and individuals.

Section 1 of this report sets out the results of the questionnaire which accompanied the leaflet. It looks at the sample of respondents, the preferred option by different categories and a breakdown of the results of the individual questions.

Section 2 sets out the results of a public workshop that was held to gather views on the issues and options.

Section 3 sets out the detailed responses received. This section also includes a schedule of all those organisations sent the full report.

## **SECTION 1: QUESTIONNAIRE**

### **The Sample**

The Council wanted to target a wide range of the Borough's population and therefore gathered the following information from respondents:

**Location** – Respondents were asked to leave their postal codes. 90% left their full postal codes therefore analysis of Wards could be undertaken.

- 33% are from Area 1 (Byfleet, Horsell East and Woodham, Horsell West, Pyrford, West Byfleet)
- 35% are from Area 2 (Goldsworth East, Kingfield and Westfield, Maybury and Sheerwater, Mount Hermon East, Mount Hermon West, Old Woking)
- 32% are from Area 3 (Brookwood, Goldsworth West, Hermitage and Knaphill South, Knaphill, Mayford and Sutton Green, St Johns and Hook Heath)

### **Age**

- Two percent of respondents are aged 16-24 years
- 63% are aged 25-64 years
- 31% are aged over 65 years

**Ethnic status** – The categories for ethnic group were taken from the Census of Population. In total, 92% responded to this question.

- 88% of all respondents are white
- Four percent are non-white.

### **Disability**

- Four percent of respondents are disabled.

## **Overall Opinions**

### **The Preferred Option**

- Option 2 is the preferred option for all respondents.
- Option 2 is the preferred option for Citizens Panel members (supported by 29%), closely followed by Option 4 (27%).
- Option 2 is the preferred option for non-Citizens Panel members.

### **The Least Preferred Option**

- Option 3 is the least preferred option for all respondents
- Option 3 is the least preferred option for Citizens Panel members (21%) (closely followed by option 1 (22%))
- Option 3 is the least preferred option for non-Citizens Panel members.

## **Reservations about the Options**

The questionnaire asked people to give their views on any reservations they had about their preferred option. The following lists indicate the general comments that were received.

### **i. Overall Reservations**

- There is doubt about the need for growth and the need for increased retail and offices when so many existing premises are vacant – should improve the existing stock instead
- Some respondents are very doubtful of the shift from private transport to public transport
- Social and community infrastructure provision is not accounted for therefore respondents feel that future need will not be met.
- Reserve sites should not be used
- Concern about using back gardens for new housing developments
- Need for affordable flats in all areas and affordable family housing close to the town centre, not just on reserve sites.

### **ii. Option 1 Reservations**

- Is there a need for more retail and office space when there is evidence of vacant shops and offices? Existing premises should be improved and used.
- How will infrastructure cope with projected growth?
- Transport infrastructure  
inadequate provision for private motorists  
growth implies an increase in peak time traffic/ congestion  
reservations about shift to public transport  
seems a lack of commitment to public transport investment  
Need adequate provision of parking with residential developments
- Social and community infrastructure  
Projected growth implies increased demand for public utilities and services - no detail of this provision.
- Need to protect Public Open Spaces – utilise Basingstoke Canal for culture/ leisure – no detail is provided on this.
- Option 1 needs to provide affordable housing too.

iii. Option 2 Reservations

- Objection to expansion of town centre boundary
  - Villages should remain as villages, however, some say that development away from the town centre will improve/ ease traffic congestion in town centre.
  - Re-develop existing town centre areas instead of expanding.
- Transport infrastructure
  - Essential to secure funding for transport improvements
  - Concern over impact of Park and ride – the space that it will use and the journeys made to use it
  - Alternatives to car – increase provision of cycle ways
  - Bus lanes are pointless
  - Implement more CPZs to prevent commuter parking
- Affordable housing provision
  - Family housing should be provided on the periphery (walking distance) of Woking town centre (Family affordable apartments?)
  - Doubt that commuted payments for affordable housing would work.
  - Affordable housing as proposed in Option 3 is preferred, but with the economy and retail elements of Option 2.
  - Both houses and apartments in villages and Woking town centre.
- Office provision is not necessary and should be outside Woking town centre.
- Social and community infrastructure – no mention of provision to match population increase and demand.
- Retail is not needed
  - Take account of retail park expansion
  - Improve existing stock

iv. Option 3 Reservations

- Infrastructure
  - 1) Transport
    - An increase in population further from the town centre will lead to increased car usage.
    - Cross-borough travel demand will increase therefore park and ride is necessary.
    - Reservations that people will not use public transport because of cost and frequency of service
    - Cycling routes need drastic improvement – provision and safety
  - 2) Social and community
    - Provision of services is essential to meet growth

Housing

Should not use reserve sites  
Brookwood should be developed before Moor Lane as it has better infrastructure  
Will affordable family housing stay affordable (once sold on open market)?  
Low cost areas may lead to ghettos – need housing mix.  
Too much housing causes overcrowding, congestion, and strain on resources.

Offices

Not needed in Woking  
West Byfleet does not have enough space for more offices  
Offices should be located where there is already good public transport

v. Option 4 Reservations

- Housing will be at risk of flood at Moor Lane
- Infrastructure provision to meet the needs of an increased population
- Offices are not needed
- Concern about increased traffic in West Byfleet
- Park and ride is essential
- Ensure adequate parking provision with new flats
- Family housing must be affordable
- Limit development at Brookwood to protect open spaces
- Reservations about the use of reserve land
- Retail mix is important
- Retail in West Byfleet only if character of the area is preserved

**Table 1: Preferred Option by Breakdown of Population**

				Age - all						Ethnic origin - all						Disability - all
	All	Citizens Panel	Non-Citizens Panel	Under 16	16-24	25-44	45-64	65-79	80+	White	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Chinese	Mixed	Other	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1202</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>1061</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Option 1</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>
%	24	22	26	30	26	21	25	24	21	23	25	0	0	45	57	31
%	100	47	53	-												
<b>Option 2</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
%	31	29	34	20	26	41	35	23	16	32	46	67	0	18	14	12
%	100	47	53													
<b>Option 3</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>
%	18	21	14	30	32	20	16	18	16	18	17	0	0	9	0	16
%	100	61	39													
<b>Option 4</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>
%	25	27	23	20	16	19	22	33	45	25	21	33	100	18	43	35
%	100	56	44													
<b>No option</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
%	3	3	4	0	0	2	3	3	9	3	0	0	0	9	0	4
%	100	49	51													

**Table 2: How each element of the Options is supported**

<b>Question 1: Homes to suit all needs and pockets</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CP</b>	<b>Non-CP</b>
	1202	622	580
Support Option A: New apartments in and around Woking Town Centre	528	240	288
%	44	39	50
Support Option B: Apartments and houses on former office / industrial sites and waste land	1024	537	487
%	85	86	84
Support Option C: Redevelopment of existing houses and their gardens to provide more houses/ apartments	312	158	154
%	26	25	27
Support Option D: Houses/ apartments on the existing “safeguarded long term development sites” specifically to provide affordable housing	488	288	200
%	41	46	34

  

<b>Question 2: A busy, buoyant economy</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CP</b>	<b>Non-CP</b>
	1202	622	580
Support Option A: New offices in Woking Town Centre	462	218	255
%	38	35	44
Support Option B: New offices and industrial premises in existing industrial and business parks	1025	527	498
%	85	85	86
Support Option C: New offices in West Byfleet centre	353	190	163
%	29	31	28

<b>Question 3: Woking Town Centre as a growing hub and attractive local communities</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CP</b>	<b>Non-CP</b>
	1202	622	580
Support Option A: New shopping development in Woking Town Centre	798	405	393
%	66	65	68
Support Option B: New shopping development in West Byfleet	467	258	209
%	39	41	36

<b>Question 4: Safe and reliable roads and public transport</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CP</b>	<b>Non-CP</b>
	1202	622	580
Support Option A: Increases in road capacity for private cars on major roads in and around Woking Town Centre	366	208	158
%	30	33	27
Support Option B: Bus lanes on major roads in and around Woking Town Centre and major business areas	332	163	169
%	28	26	29
Support Option C: Improved waiting areas and interchange facilities for bus and train users	746	379	367
%	62	61	63
Support Option D: Additional safe cycle routes	642	332	310
%	53	53	53
Support Option E: Additional safe walking routes	732	372	360
%	61	60	62
Support Option F: Providing park and ride sites with public transport into Woking Town Centre	708	373	335
%	59	60	58

<b>Question 5: High quality sustainable development which addresses climate change</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CP</b>	<b>Non-CP</b>
	1202	622	580
Prefer Option A: The Council should insist that all new buildings are designed to make use of sustainable and renewable energy.	911	477	434
%	76	77	75
Prefer Option B: The Council should advise developers about sustainable and renewable energy but not make it a requirement.	264	133	131
%	22	21	23

**Table 3: Preferred Option by Area**

	<b>Area 1</b>	<b>Area 2</b>	<b>Area 3</b>
<b>Total</b>	350	360	331
<b>Option 1</b>	91	84	77
%	26	23	23
<b>Option 2</b>	113	106	115
%	32	29	35
<b>Option 3</b>	44	68	67
%	13	19	20
<b>Option 4</b>	102	102	72
%	29	28	22

- Area 1 - Byfleet, Horsell East and Woodham, Horsell West, Pyrford, West Byfleet
- Area 2 - Goldsworth East, Kingfield and Westfield, Maybury and Sheerwater, Mount Hermon East, Mount Hermon West, Old Woking
- Area 3 - Brookwood, Goldsworth West, Hermitage and Knaphill South, Knaphill, Mayford and Sutton Green, St Johns and Hook Heath

**Table 4: Preferred Option by Ward Area**

Ward	Total no. of respondents	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	No. of responses	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
<b>Total</b>	1052	287	378	212	304	1181	350	360	331
<b>Brookwood</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>66</b>			<b>66</b>
%		6	8	6	2				20
%		28	46	20	8				
<b>Byfleet</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>		
%		3	4	3	7		14		
%		19	26	17	43				
<b>Goldsworth East</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>81</b>		<b>81</b>	
%		7	5	7	9			23	
%		25	23	18	31				
<b>Goldsworth West</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>44</b>			<b>44</b>
%		2	4	4	5				13
%		13	30	17	35				
<b>Hermitage &amp; Knaphill South</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>32</b>			<b>32</b>
%		2	3	3	3				10
%		18	30	21	27				
<b>Horsell East &amp; Woodham</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>73</b>		
%		9	4	4	7		21		
%		38	22	13	29				
<b>Horsell West</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>		
%		8	7	6	9		26		

Ward	Total no. of respondents	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	No. of responses	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
%		24	31	14	30				
<b>Kingfield and Westfield</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>81</b>		<b>81</b>	
%		7	9	5	6			23	
%		23	43	12	21				
<b>Knaphill</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>74</b>			<b>74</b>
%		3	6	11	6				22
%		14	30	33	25				
<b>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37</b>		<b>37</b>	
%		1	2	5	4			10	
%		11	24	29	34				
<b>Mayford &amp; Sutton Green</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>41</b>			<b>41</b>
%		5	4	2	2				12
%		34	41	12	12				
<b>Mount Hermon East</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>61</b>		<b>61</b>	
%		6	4	6	6			17	
%		25	25	19	27				
<b>Mount Hermon West</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>78</b>		<b>78</b>	
%		6	5	8	7			22	
%		23	26	23	28				
<b>Old Woking</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>22</b>	
%		2	2	1	2			6	
%		25	29	8	29				
<b>Pyrford</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>		

Ward	Total no. of respondents	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	No. of responses	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
%		5	4	2	7		16		
%		24	29	9	34				
<b>St Johns &amp; Hook Heath</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>74</b>			<b>74</b>
%		8	6	5	6				22
%		31	29	13	25				
<b>West Byfleet</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>82</b>		
%		7	11	4	5		23		
%		23	48	11	17				

**SECTION 2**

**RESULTS OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

## **INTRODUCTION**

A public workshop was held on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2005 to help in the development of Woking's Local Development Framework Core Strategy document.

The group was given a presentation on the four options for development and how these related to the first stage of engagement which took place last year.

Participants were then split into groups and the workshop took the following format:

### **Session 1**

Detailed discussions were had on each element of the options:

- Housing
- Transport
- Retail
- Economy
- Sustainability and the natural and built environment

### **Session 2**

Participants were able to discuss each option as a whole

### **Session 3**

Participants voted on their preferred option.

## SESSION 1

Discussions on each element of the options:

### HOUSING

- A. New apartments at high density in and around Woking Town Centre
- B. Apartments and houses on former office / industrial sites and waste land
- C. Redevelopment of existing houses and their gardens to provide more houses / apartments
- D. Houses/apartments on the existing “safeguarded long-term development sites” specifically to provide affordable family housing.

### Sustainability Issues

- Promote ‘Bedzed’ type development – highly sustainable
- Importance of sustainability

### Affordability

- Balance and range of housing stock important (e.g. price)
- Need affordable family accommodation (not just apartments)
- Remind people all the time that affordable housing is a priority
- Affordable place to live not just the cost of houses
- Provide housing for key workers
- How do you keep affordable housing affordable?
- 3 types of affordable-
  1. Just cannot afford to buy
  2. Need help to start
  3. Competitive housing matches cost in other parts of country

### Community cohesion

- No ghettos
- Try to maintain communities (Council Tax)

### Type of Dwelling Provision

- Not too many apartments
- Not to rush into apartments until we have learned lessons
- West Byfleet cannot take large apartment developments in the centre
- Prefer Woking town centre development rather than green space but need to be well planned and high quality – fit for purpose

### Other comments

- If all district had higher housing numbers – impact on regional infrastructure?
- Long term future of ‘buy to let’ e.g. as an investment
- Brookwood site might be better than Moor Lane
- Car parking allocation to apartments is not a reality
- All dwellings should have at least one off-street parking space
- Encourage / incentive to share car parking
- Risk of overdevelopment? Call on halt

## TRANSPORT

The possible elements include:

- A. Increases in road capacity for private cars on major roads in and around Woking Town Centre and major business areas
- B. Bus lanes on major roads in and around Woking Town Centre and major business areas
- C. Improved waiting areas and interchange facilities for bus and train users
- D. Additional safe cycle routes
- E. Additional safe walking routes
- F. Providing park and ride sites with public transport into Woking Town Centre

### Use of the car

- Still strong demand for car - inadequate on-site parking provision
- Lack of alternative to the car – need to put public transport alternatives in place first
- Alternatives to the car need to be cost effective
- Alternative to car – car pool, car sharing, community mini buses
- Parents - school parking – use decriminalised parking enforcement (400m no parking zone)
- Increase parking standards

### Alternatives to the car

- Will people change the mode of transport unless they have to?
- Public transport is not just trains and buses - needs to be flexible (e.g. taxis, car clubs)
- More subsidised travel for young and elderly
- Improved interchange facility - creating efficient hub
- Park and ride will only be used if easier than current alternatives; geography of Woking inappropriate; may generate additional traffic
- Public transport must be more attractive (e.g. ticket buying, more leg room, more luggage space, frequency and routes)
- School transport plans - congestion charge (£5 within 200m) ... this is not enforceable

### Infrastructure

- Arterial routes needed (better links from major roads M3, A3, A25, M25)
- Victoria Arch – remove pavement and cycle lane and provide a separate tunnel
- HGV use – consider requirements for increase in new developments (retailing and business) what are implications?

### Bus service provision

- Inadequate room for bus lanes
- Provision of direct bus routes and circle bus routes must be regular (5 minutes)
- Buses should not stop at 7pm (window of operation)
- Managing bus routes on major routes - Not like Camberley bus routes on A30

### Cycling/ walking routes

- Stop wasting money on road based cycle routes - they are not used

- Need safe, off-road cycle/ walking routes
- Continuous network of cycle and walking with more (usable and safe)
- Use roads for cycle and walking use

## RETAIL

The options include two ways of delivering additional retailing. These are:

- A. New shopping development in Woking Town Centre
- B. New shopping development in West Byfleet

### Shops in Woking

- As a transport hub would people want to stay in Woking when they can catch trains to Guildford etc.
- Are there going to be enough people to enable Woking to develop as a competitor to Guildford etc.
- How can Woking be unique rather than copying other places?

### Shops in West Byfleet

- How was the research done re: West Byfleet – who had the greatest say?
- Was Internet shopping (the increase) in the future considered when the research was done?
- How would big centre developments affect the sustainability of village centres?
- Development in Woking may require more departmental stores. Some say no development in West Byfleet
- Don't need competition of two shopping centres – Woking is enough – would rather no development in West Byfleet
- Smaller centres won't want/ need their own shops, not a copy of Woking.
- A second centre would allow for the mix of smaller shops that could not afford/ support development in Woking.
- Having two centres spreads the load and would not 'flood' Woking
- How does the emphasis on housing development fit with concentrating on one or two main shopping areas – will people have to travel?

### New provision

- Is there a need when there are so many empty shops now?
- Need to provide shopping experience that encourages our population to shop here – e.g. commuters
- Need to ensure we have the shops that attract and meet the needs of future (more sophisticated!) population
- High rise flats should include shops on the ground floor
- Need for low cost retail units
- Woking can claim to be the most accessible town in Surrey - no cobbles!

### Transport and shopping

- Where will shoppers in centres park? – is the planning of transport considered – e.g. more parking places or better public transport that can be sustained long-term.
- It should be a planning condition that new central shops provide free transport to their premises

- Consider park and ride in places like Brookwood and Worplesdon to allow people to catch a train to Woking.

#### Types of shops

- Retail development needs to take into consideration the unique selling points of smaller shops not just concentrate on large chains.
- How can the options support small local businesses not just large chains?
- Is the quality mixing more important than the quantity regarding shops?
- Quality Vs quantity – but you need the shoppers.
- Don't need two shopping centres so close and duplication of shops

#### ECONOMY

The options include a range of different ways of delivering future economic growth. These include:

- A. New offices in Woking Town Centre
- B. New offices and industrial premises in existing industrial and business parks
- C. New offices in West Byfleet centre.

#### Employment

##### New Offices

- Enough vacant office buildings - Need to fill existing offices before building new ones
- Need to focus employment growth near public transport
- How to attract businesses in? – don't just need offices – variety of premises needed, e.g. variety of specialist units (with shops), manufacturing units, large and small offices - at the right rental costs and business rates = total cost.
- Need to consider whether to build up, or out, or both? - No thought if building up is right. Need a mix of the 3 elements and mix of locations
- What types of job growth? In service industry, manufacturing?
- What is the 'local economy'?
- Small business units (for 3 or 4 people) – need more. There are none empty. Start up units at reasonable costs.

What % of offices is currently vacant in Woking and West Byfleet?

One of the lowest unemployment rates in the country therefore do we need more employment land?

Increase home-working so future need for more 'live-work' type units, e.g. craft workers, artists etc.

Nice to have sites with a mix of housing and employment uses - reduce the need to travel

Economy will dictate need

Some existing offices are outdated. Obsolete (but cheaper to rent).

- Need flexibility to change use of employment premises later to other uses
- Options 3 and 4 imply more employment growth and 1 and 2 less so.
- Question perception of need
- Need co-operation in area (for all 5 elements, not just economy) to consider provision of different employment uses between Woking and other surrounding – lose towns
- Difficult to forecast for 10 years time

### New Offices in Woking Town Centre

- Traffic and parking, especially near the station
  - Extra jobs from Surrey County Council move to Woking? (in addition to those mentioned in Options?) Sufficient room for later growth? Loss of existing car park at the site to bring in economic activity
  - Some shops closing are simply relocating in the town centre
- Night time economy – bars etc. crammed in one road need more diversity in the town centre
- Cap Gemini
  - Woking must remain an attractive place, e.g. traffic, environment etc to attract businesses

### New offices in West Byfleet centre

- Fall in no. of businesses in West Byfleet therefore why then look to expand employment there? (Clarification – options don't propose more in West Byfleet)
- No unmet demand in West Byfleet at present. Mouchel going, Broadoaks development essential
- Convert existing obsolete offices in West Byfleet to flats? Could replace with residential and employment uses.
- No need for C –new offices in West Byfleet

### Existing industrial parks

- Sheerwater is less accessible therefore need to choose appropriate location
  - Are existing business parks in the right places – before extending them?
- Importance of strategic location/ good access e.g. Brooklands

### Transport issues

- Network rail need to increase capacity, carriages full. What other types of transport - buses? And what government funding?
- Role as transport hub - links to London

## SUSTAINABILITY AND THE NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

### Public Open space

- Severe shortage of public open space for football – pitches and changing facilities
- Also very little public space for children at present – ensure that new developments have sufficient provision
- Provision is patchy – some good facilities and some poor ones – improve the quality of current provision
- Current urban open space should be used more efficiently

### Protecting and enhancing the natural environment

- More knowledge needed about the impact of options on biodiversity – what are the environmental policies?
- Not enough information about the numbers underpinning the options and what their environmental effect might be.
- Climate change should be the highest priority
- Mixed developments are more environmentally desirable/ sustainable
- Be aware of the consequences of 'infilling' on the local wildlife and flooding
- Use of water efficiency
- Waste disposal should be a part of LDF as it has effect on environment

- Greater encouragement of energy efficiency and renewable energy in private developments

#### Protecting and enhancing the built environment

- Maintain and improve visual amenity/ 'look and feel of the place' – maintain the character of villages (West Byfleet)
- Care about landscaping new developments – suitable planting/ trees and maintenance thereof.
- Must build in consideration of noise pollution
- Sufficient 'buffer zone' around developments to protect the amenity of the area

#### Climate change

- Are the sustainable initiatives e.g. CHP and recycling performing? More info needed to help public to understand and make decisions on options

#### Other comments

- Concern that insufficient car parking will be provided with dense development - Challenge government quotas
- Ensure that entertainment facilities are considered
- Visual impact of mobile phone masts is detrimental

## SESSION 2

Discussions were held on each option as a whole:

	<u>GROUP 1</u>	<u>GROUP 2</u>
<b>OPTION 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the 'full potential' of the economy? Not valid, suggests a great opportunity may be missed</li> <li>• Vacancies in the town centre</li> <li>• Substitute 'target', not full potential</li> <li>• Support Option 1 but WBC will not support it</li> <li>• If continue with current policies will exceed Option 1 so stay with this</li> <li>• Government will not accept this level - unsustainable</li> <li>• Jobs issues should be separated from the population issue</li> <li>• No substantial retail growth in Option 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we already exceeding Option 1 and would be able to stop at this if we wanted to?</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Overall SUPPORT</b></li> <li>• Support for Option 2 as Option 1 is too limited</li> <li>• Provides good amount of element of affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need further than Option 2 –</li> <li>• Hold here while we re-assess transport network, environment and open space, leisure, recreation</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SUPPORT</b></li> <li>• Why do we have to have more retail development in West Byfleet? No support for this as empty shops in Woking Borough, but do support a vibrant Woking town centre.</li> <li>• Housing more important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot support that level of development in West Byfleet (and Option 4)</li> <li>• (And 4) these can't work without major infrastructure which would have to be funded by government</li> <li>• May be better in terms of affordable housing</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>DO NOT SUPPORT</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is 2016 a realistic timescale bearing in mind the infrastructure requirements?</li> </ul>

## GENERAL POINTS

GROUP 1	GROUP 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Options will cause out-migration. Those on fixed incomes will move out, to the south-west</li><li>• Need to maintain varied society (will change demographics of population)</li><li>• No-one here tonight representing young professional couples - Their needs are being catered for by Woking now?</li><li>• Hard to comment on any options in absence of information on need for key worker and affordable housing</li><li>• Which option provides for key worker dwellings? How much key worker dwellings in each option?</li><li>• Can't buck supply and demand or will distort house prices etc.</li><li>• % affordable housing should be increased 35-40%</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clearer understanding needed of 'full potential'</li><li>• What do we lose if we don't reach 'full potential'?</li><li>• Need better understanding of supporting data and information</li><li>• Are these really options within regional guidance and government guidelines?</li><li>• Questionnaire was not delivered to every household</li><li>• How do we know that the investment will result in the perceived benefits?</li><li>• What's the implication for the Council Tax payer?</li><li>• Concern about lack of joint responsibility for the road infrastructure</li><li>• We need to protect the character of local communities</li></ul>

## SESSION 3

**OPTION 1** – 2 votes

**OPTION 2** – 11 votes (includes two half votes for the retail element)

**OPTION 3** – 3 votes (includes two half votes for the housing element)

**OPTION 4** – 0 votes

**SECTION 3**

**DETAILED REPRESENTATIONS AND THE COUNCIL RESPONSE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The following schedule sets out all the representations made during the issues and options consultation and the Council's response. It is set out in alphabetical order of subjects. The following subjects are covered:

Built Environment  
Climate Change  
Economy  
General Comments  
Housing  
Natural Environment  
Open Space  
Other comments  
Overall Options  
Retail  
Social and Community Infrastructure  
Transport

Within each subject the representations are listed in alphabetical order of respondent. At the end of the schedule there is a list of all organisations sent the Core Strategy Issues and Options Report as part of the consultation exercise.

Please note that comments made on the Sustainability Appraisal are recorded and responded to separately in Appendix 8 of the Sustainability Appraisal report.

## CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPRESENTATIONS AND THE COUNCIL RESPONSE

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
11	Elmbridge Borough Council		34 Acknowledgement of letter. No comments submitted.	None Required.
25	Runnymede Borough Council		58 Acknowledges receipt of Core strategy. No comments made.	Noted.
2	English Heritage	Built environment	95 Looks forward to the historic environment being given greater prominence than in para 4.5 of the Issues and Options report. Considers that the greater focus on mitigation and management required to protect the environment under the higher growth options should include the historic environment.	<p>Policies in the Core Strategy, including policy GDC1 Design and policy DC1 Conservation Areas, will generally protect the elements of the historic environment identified in the existing Local Plan.</p> <p>However the Core Strategy will undertake to review the Woking Town Centre Conservation Area to assess whether all the currently defined area remains worthy of protection. As noted in the Initial Sustainability Report, the specific relationship between the Woking Town Centre Conservation Area designation and the proposals for further development in the town centre need to be addressed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the preferred option.</p>
17	Local Agenda 21	Built environment	82 Support for sustainable design and construction methods to support renewable energy initiatives (and zero emission targets) and climate change	These issues will be dealt with by the Core Strategy Generic Development Control Policies, GDC1 Design and GDC2 Energy Efficiency.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Built environment	12 SCC recommends that policies must refer to protecting and or mitigate (as well as use good design) the effects of development on the built environment if all the options are to protect and enhance (page 4) the built environment.	This issue is addressed by policies GDC1 Design and GDC5 Planning Obligations.
10	Environment Agency	Climate change	31 EA suggests that Woking's Climate Neutral Development good practice guide could/should form	The Core Strategy Generic Development Control Policies GDC1 Design and GDC2 Energy Efficiency

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
			the basis of policy rather than a guide	will consider climate change issues.
17	Local Agenda 21	Climate change	46 Air travel is a major contributor to climate change. Challenge any role for Woking in supporting the airport infrastructure. Government targets to control carbon emissions will require air travel to be curbed.	The provision of improved rail links to Heathrow will reduce emissions compared with the alternative means of surface access - car travel. Therefore it makes a positive contribution to sustainable development. Any development in Woking Town Centre which results from the new link will also make a positive contribution to sustainable development for the same reason. The specific issue of emissions from aircraft is dealt with by central Government policy.
17	Local Agenda 21	Climate change	74 The magnitude of the threat posed by climate change is not understood by many people. This could be partly mitigated by sustainable design and construction methods.	The Core Strategy Generic Development Control Policies GDC1 Design and GDC2 Energy Efficiency will consider climate change issues.
17	Local Agenda 21	Climate change	75 It is realistically unlikely that there will be a substantial switch to non-car methods of transport to offset increased carbon emissions from more cars, however hard we try.	Implications of respondents point is that in their view Options 3 and 4 will generate more traffic and so should not be encouraged. The preferred option generally proposes levels of development at Option 2, which is in line with this respondent's general preference.  The Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study model will be used to predict how substantial the switch to non-car modes will be. The strategy will be developed to reflect this. Actual progress will be monitored and the strategy amended if required.
17	Local Agenda 21	Climate change	83 Since the SE is already one of the driest regions in the country, concern is expressed that potential water shortage issues are not addressed in the Core Strategy	At a regional level SEERA, EA and others are working together to ensure water resources will be sufficient to deliver the South East Plan. The Core Strategy preferred option will be in accordance with the South East Plan, and this is the way in which water resource

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
					issues are taken into account.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Climate change	13	SCC support WBC policies on climate change.	Note support.
36	Three Valleys Water	Climate change	158	The SE receives on average 50% less rainfall than the rest of the UK with 20% higher than average consumption. The water Act 2003 places a duty for public authorities to promote water conservation. Opportunities to do this through the LDF would be welcome	The Core Strategy Generic Development Control Policies, GDC1 Design and GDC2 Energy Efficiency, will address sustainable drainage.
17	Local Agenda 21	Economy	79	LA 21 supports initiatives to encourage local employment (and therefore reduced travel) and thinks the town centre is most suitable. LA21 stresses the need to recognise a diverse range of employment growth sectors (e.g. health, education, retail, cultural and community uses) and the trend towards home working	<p>Note support for town centre as an employment growth point. Employment Forecasts in the Woking Employment Needs Assessment do predict growth in a diverse range of sectors including those identified in the representation.</p> <p>The Core Strategy identifies the town centre as a preferred location for most of the sectors identified.</p> <p>Evidence set out in the Woking Employment Needs Assessment shows no increase in worker/floorspace ratios to date as a result of homeworking. Therefore it is not appropriate for the forecasts of new office space required to accommodate employment growth to make an allowance for the effects of homeworking at the present time.</p>
17	Local Agenda 21	Economy	120	The need for large increases in office space is questioned given trends in working practices including some home working leading to office space sharing	<p>Evidence set out in the Woking Employment Needs Assessment shows no change in worker/floorspace ratios to date as a result of homeworking.</p> <p>Therefore it is not appropriate for the forecasts of new</p>

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
					office space required to accommodate employment growth to make an allowance for the effects of homeworking at the present time.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Economy	3	SCC raise concern that the economic growth forecasts applied to the options may be over optimistic. SCC is highly critical of the growth forecasts produced for SEERA & the SE Plan. On employment grounds SCC questions the need for options 3 & 4.	Note concern. The preferred option provides for an overall level of development at Option 2. The Employment Needs Assessment indicates that this will not provide sufficient business and industrial floorspace to accommodate all the growth forecast by Experian. This is necessary because of transport infrastructure limitations as identified by Surrey CC. This addresses the County Council's point. This will require careful monitoring in the AMR to assess how much demand there proves to be for additional employment floorspace.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	62	TSE stresses that tourism considerations should be incorporated into LDF policy as drivers of the local economy	The tourism and visitor sector is incorporated into the LDF evidence base, strategy and policies through the Surrey Hotel Futures report.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	64	Provision should be made for new regionally significant attractions that expand the regions tourism product and market share taking account of accessibility by public transport and those with disabilities.	A specific policy on this is not appropriate in Woking. RPG9 (policy TSR3) identifies preferred parts of the south east region suitable for new regionally significant attractions. This does not include Woking.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	65	TSE supports the provision of a range of hotels particularly 4 star business hotels stressing the need for not being too restrictive on the selection of potential sites. Concern is raised that as a use class they cannot compete with alternative uses in many cases leading to a potential lack of supply. Sequential tests should not be applied to hotel development.	This point is acknowledged. The proposed policy on hotel development in the Core Strategy is not over restrictive on hotel location and does not propose a sequential test.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	128	Tourism accommodation needs to be retained, developed and encouraged. Concern is raised that	Visitor accommodation in Woking is mainly business related. The Surrey Hotel Futures report notes that

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				many such operations are purposely run down with a resultant application for change of use based on the state of the existing operation rather than latent demand for tourism accommodation. The reference suggests that an evidence base for demand may be required.	there may be some closures of non-branded accommodation of 2 star and below as it does not meet business requirements. As a result the evidence base for demand does not justify a policy to retain existing provision.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	129	In rural areas policies should be introduced to ensure a positive approach to rural conversions into tourist accommodation. A number of benefits are sited including diversification of the rural economy, securing the future of listed building or one of architectural significance and survival of a farm related business. To this end PPG2 supports the re-use of buildings within the Green Belt	This is not a significant sector of the Woking economy, and in order to keep the Core Strategy to a sensible length should not have its own policy. The generic DC policies will apply to any development proposals of this type.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	130	New serviced accommodation (Accommodation of less than 6 bed spaces). Request that policies foster a range of different types of SC from large hotels, through to inn accommodation and bed & breakfast. This is particularly important in rural areas to maximise the future role of tourism within the local economy.	This is not a significant sector of the Woking economy, and in order to keep the Core Strategy to a sensible length should not have its own policy. The generic DC policies will apply to any development proposals of this type.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	131	Static Caravan Sites Flexibility should be shown towards these sites if new or alternative sites do not come forward. Small scale static caravan sites may be a beneficial diversification for an existing tour operator. The SE Plan is explicit in facilitating the upgrading and enhancement of existing unserviced accommodation that will not harm landscape or environmental assets	This is not a significant sector of the Woking economy, and in order to keep the Core Strategy to a sensible length should not have its own policy. The generic DC policies will apply to any development proposals of this type.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	132	'Non serviced' accommodation Rural self catering units are identified as a regional priority with high growth potential with maximum	This is not a significant sector of the Woking economy, and in order to keep the Core Strategy to a sensible length should not have its own policy. The generic DC

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				economic gain because length of stay tends to be longer than serviced accommodation. This should be an essential input to LDF tourism strategy and policy.	policies will apply to any development proposals of this type.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	133	Camping and Caravan Sites TSE supports initiatives for enhancing the standards of existing facilities and the environmental quality of sites. Policy should avoid restricting the use of sites beyond four weeks in any calendar year to allow operators to meet seasonal demands and off peak periods.	This is not a significant sector of the Woking economy, and in order to keep the Core Strategy to a sensible length should not have its own policy. The generic DC policies will apply to any development proposals of this type.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	134	Occupancy controls LDF policies should allow operators flexibility to open throughout the year to help aid seasonality. Conditions preventing occupancy outside the main tourist seasons are now out-dated. Conditions that prevent opening for 1 month in the year are proposed as an appropriate and enforceable way forward.	This is not a significant sector of the Woking economy, and in order to keep the Core Strategy to a sensible length should not have its own policy. The generic DC policies will apply to any development proposals of this type.
28	Tourism South East	Economy	137	Conference facilities Planning policies need to recognise the contribution these make to the business and economy of an area. Provision should be made for new and improved facilities where there is a recognised deficit.	The evidence base (Surrey Hotel Futures) has identified low growth prospects in the residential conference market. As a result it is not appropriate to have a specific policy on this issue.
3	English Nature	General	97	English Nature commented on the sustainability report at the Scoping stage that is referred to in the current document with reference to development of site allocations and development control policies. EN would like these points to be considered when developing policies and when assessing sustainability since many of English Natures concerns are still outstanding.  Officer note: The scoping report schedule of responses identifies the following issues:	1. This is being addressed through participation in English Nature's Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Plan project.  2. This is being addressed through participation in English Nature's Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Plan project.  3. This issue is dealt with by existing legislation.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
			<p>1. Need for the impact of LDF housing allocations and DC policies on the SPA to be assessed by an in-combination assessment of all proposals affecting the SPA.</p> <p>2. Concern about cumulative effect of development on these areas, including increased recreational pressure</p> <p>3. Need to properly survey all areas subject to planning applications to identify presence of protected species.</p> <p>4. Specific points about protecting the non-SSSI part of the Basingstoke canal, and the non SSSI Heathland habitats.</p> <p>5. Need to restore and recreate heathland habitats in accordance with SE Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>6. Recommendation as to amount and accessibility of open space required.</p> <p>7. Distinguish between ancient woodland and planted woodland. Protect Ancient woodland and prioritise planted woodland for heathland restoration.</p>	<p>4. Non-SSSI Heathland habitats have been surveyed by Surrey Wildlife Trust who have recommended SNCI designation where they are of sufficient nature conservation value. SWT have also recommended designation of the non-SSSI part of the Basingstoke Canal as an SNCI. These designations are shown on the proposals map.</p> <p>5. This should be achieved through mitigation of new residential development, through application of English Nature's SPA delivery plan and its adoption as SPD.</p> <p>6. The Council's PPG17 Audit has had regard to English Nature's standards for accessibility to greenspace.</p> <p>7. Woodland has been surveyed by Surrey Wildlife Trust who have recommended SNCI designation where it is of sufficient nature conservation value. These designations are shown on the proposals map... Heathland restoration should be achieved through mitigation of new residential development, through application of English Nature's SPA delivery plan and its adoption as SPD.</p>
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	General	84 Policies are required to promote sustainable design, construction and demolition techniques. Recycling policies (incorporating into new sites) for minerals released from development sites should also be considered.	This will be dealt with by the Core Strategy Generic Development Control Policy GDC1 Design.
1	Planning and Countryside Service,	General	85 Potentially workable sand and gravel reserves in Woking should be recognised and safeguarded against	The requirement to include on the proposals map any minerals and waste matters including safeguarding

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
	Surrey CC		sterilisation from other forms of development.	areas, minerals consultation areas and any minerals and waste allocations which are in the adopted Surrey Mineral and Waste Development Framework is noted (as per PPS12 para 2.22). This will come into force once the MWDF has been adopted.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Housing	36 Objection to options 3/4 based on the proposed housing densities in West Byfleet are too high leading to developments out of scale & proportion to the existing buildings.	Noted. The preferred option provides for housing development in District and Local Centres of a density which integrates with the existing urban form, having regard to the guideline in Government Guidance (PPG3) of 30 - 50 dwellings per hectare.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Housing	112 Objection to proposed housing densities in Pyrford and outside West Byfleet centre on the basis that they are much higher than present.	Policy sets a range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare in residential areas throughout the Borough. This is in line with PPG3. Exceptions can be made where development at this density cannot be fitted into the urban form of the area. This provides an adequate safeguard for the character of residential areas.
12	CALA Homes C/O Barton Willmore	Housing	35 The respondent works on behalf of a developer who has an interest in the Brookwood Farm (safeguarded site). Support for Option 4 based on sustainability criteria especially those that relate to housing. They emphasise the need to take a longer term view of at least 10 years and covering the structure plan period up to 2026.	The Core Strategy end date of 2017 will provide 10 years from the date of adoption.
12	CALA Homes C/O Barton Willmore	Housing	107 In terms of type of housing site the responded supports a mixed approach to the options explained in 1 (Page 2 Proposals for Housing) with a balance portfolio of land coming from each of the potential sources.	Noted. The preferred option allows for a balanced provision of housing from the different sources, in the context of the sequential test set out in PPG3.
12	CALA Homes C/O Barton Willmore	Housing	108 A suggestion is made that further study may be required to assess the quantum of brownfield sites that can realistically be developed through 1) An urban	The Woking Housing Potential Study, already published, provides the evidence base on this issue. No further work is required.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				capacity assessment looking at all potential sources in accordance with advice contained in "Tapping the Potential" 2) Studies that look at higher densities and thresholds that will eventually erode the environmental capital of the centre.	
12	CALA Homes C/O Barton Willmore	Housing	109	There is some concern that the safeguarded sites may be over represented for affordable housing conflicting with PPG3 (Paragraph 10) that encourages mixed and balanced communities.	Proposed policy would require at least 60% of new homes on safeguarded long term development sites to be affordable, made up of a mixture of social rented and other affordable homes. This will maximise the provision of affordable family housing while still creating a mixed and balanced community.
12	CALA Homes C/O Barton Willmore	Housing	110	The respondent objection to Woking Town Centre being referred to as a hub rather than the town as a whole (as identified in the South East Plan). The Core Strategy should identify locations outside the Town Centre that offer opportunities for substantial development.	The existing description of Woking Town Centre as a hub is in accordance with the wording in the draft South East Plan. This states at para 1.27 "usually the town centre should be the prime focus of the hub". In Woking PTAM maps show that accessibility by public transport away from the town centre declines rapidly, and only the town centre meets the criteria for being a hub.
12	CALA Homes C/O Barton Willmore	Housing	116	The apparent priority given to the Moore Lane safeguarded site is questioned. A request is made to undertake a comparative assessment between the two safeguarded sites (with reference to the Criteria of Paragraph 31 PPG3) to determine priority for development.	This point is accepted. It will be for the Site Allocations DPD to make such a comparative assessment and determine priorities. No priority order is set out in the Core Strategy itself.
14	Friends, Families and Travellers	Housing	39	Refers to the Gypsy and Traveller Law reform Coalition which contains a useful guidance document setting out advice on gypsy and traveller accommodation needs and the new planning system. Officer note: Key points from the guidance document are: 1. Advice on methods to consult gypsies and travellers 2. A gypsy and	1. This is dealt with in the Statement of Community Involvement 2. A gypsy and traveller housing need assessment is currently being carried out and will be available to inform production of the Core Strategy prior to adoption. 3. Noted. The Core Strategy identifies Gypsies and Travellers as a group whose

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				traveller housing needs assessment should be carried out 3. Local Authorities are urged to identify suitable sites immediately, not wait until Site Allocations DPD's are produced.	housing needs should be met. However, any sites for gypsy and traveller accommodation will be identified by the Council in the Site Allocations DPD, not in advance of it.
15	House Builders Federation - Southern region	Housing	40	Option 4 is chosen all others rejected on the basis that it provides affordable homes and mixed and balanced sustainable communities	The preferred option provides for all the housing elements in Option 4 to be provided if required to meet overall housing provision or affordable housing need. However this is planned to be delivered in accordance with the level of housing provision for Woking set out in the draft South East Plan.
15	House Builders Federation - Southern region	Housing	41	Reference is made for the necessity for housing on a 10 year forward planning basis. The respondent suggests that the period covered to 2016 may need to be extended given that the adoption of the core strategy choice may not take place until late 2006/7. An end date of 2021 or 2026 is suggested.	Change recommended. The end date for the Core Strategy is now proposed to be 2017, to ensure 10 years outstanding at the date of adoption.
15	House Builders Federation - Southern region	Housing	118	Support for continued identification of selected sites which can be held back in the short term if not needed.	This is the approach adopted in the preferred option. The safeguarded long term sites will be held back if not required to meet overall housing provision or affordable housing need.
16	Humberts	Housing	43	Humberts support the development of Moor Lane because it has good road infrastructure (A320 & A247) combined with policies to reduce car dependency.	Noted. The Preferred Option indicates that the safeguarded long-term development sites continue to be a suitable reserve, to be released if required to meet affordable housing need or general housing provision.
16	Humberts	Housing	119	Development of Moor Lane site will enable Woking to provide for key workers. The Local Development Framework should include this area	Noted. The Preferred Option indicates that the safeguarded long-term development sites continue to be a suitable reserve, to be released if required to meet affordable housing need or general housing provision.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
8	Levvel	Housing	<p>26 Concern that affordable housing provisions and thresholds have not taken account of a robust and up to date evidence base taking into account all stakeholders in accordance with the SCI. Levvel feel that no evidence is put forward to justify a 35% target and that every option has a 35 % target. The housing potential study sets a 40% target and yet a 35% target is set in the Core Strategy Options .The validity of the Housing Needs Assessment data is also questioned. The affordable housing strategy does not take account of the viability or suitability for affordable housing. Overall there is an objection to the soundness of the affordable housing policy based on the inadequacy of the evidence base. The Options assume that all sites will contribute to affordable housing which takes no account of present or future policy which sets a threshold below which sites will not contribute to affordable housing. Also it does not recognise that the suitability and viability of sites must be taken into account.</p>	<p>The evidence base for the level of affordable housing need is the 2001 Housing Needs Assessment, which used primary research data, updated in 2004 using Census data and other secondary data sources. The 2004 update demonstrated that the findings of the 2001 HNA remain valid. A further review of the housing needs assessment is to be carried out in 2006, and this will enable any changes to the evidence base to be taken account of before adoption of the Core Strategy. The 35% target for affordable housing is taken from Woking BC SPG on Affordable Housing which was adopted following substantial consultation in 2004. The point regarding a 40% target is noted. This is also the target in the Surrey Structure Plan and expected to be in the South East Plan London Fringe Strategy. As a result 40% affordable housing is the target in the Preferred Option. Subject to the final version of Planning Policy Statement 3 - Housing permitting it, a tariff will be applied to development of below 15 units, at a rate which does not prevent development being economically viable.</p>
17	Local Agenda 21	Housing	<p>47 Denser housing with less car parking may be desirable, but will they be acceptable to householders? It would make sense not to develop too rapidly in this approach.</p>	<p>The preferred option assumes around 60% of new homes will be developed as apartments with limited parking. It does not require apartment building to continue at as high a level as over the last few years. However it is accepted that even at a slightly lower level this strategy is not risk free, as this is a relatively new market, and the long term level of demand cannot be known. The level of development will be monitored annually to ensure that housing is being delivered as anticipated. The Preferred Option sets out the principle</p>

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
					of reduced parking standards in the High Accessibility Zone in and around Woking Town Centre. The detailed standards will be set out in Parking Standards SPD, which will be subject of separate consultation.
17	Local Agenda 21	Housing	77	There is support for all affordable housing options of 35%. Can this be increased to meet needs. A request is made to consider smaller sites and to encourage social integration and socially mixed developments. Large as well as smaller units should be required on sites	The point regarding a 40% target is noted. This is also the target in the Surrey Structure Plan and expected to be in the South East Plan London Fringe Strategy. As a result 40% affordable housing is the target in the Preferred Option. Policy will reduce the threshold to 15 units. Below this a tariff will apply, provided Government Guidance (the final version of new PPS3) permits this. The Preferred Option requires a mix of size of open market units within larger developments. Smaller sites are not large enough for this to be necessary to ensure balanced communities. Requirements for individual sites will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD.
17	Local Agenda 21	Housing	78	Commuted sums for affordable housing is not supported because it does not encourage socially mixed development	Agreed that achieving socially mixed development is an important policy objective. However, commuted sums are appropriate if the housing to be provided on site would not meet an outstanding affordable housing need. Currently this is the case with additional social rented 1 and 2 bed non-family units. In all cases where suitable affordable housing can be provided on site, the policy will seek it, in preference to a commuted sum.
20	Mr Black	Housing	50	Respondent is a gypsy and is requesting that travellers be considered in future allocations of land for both permanent and transit sites. He requests to be updated on future plans but cannot read or write.	Core Strategy identifies gypsy and traveller sites as a legitimate housing need. The allocation of specific sites will be for the Site Allocations DPD. Statement of Community Involvement addresses how the Council will engage with hard to reach groups.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
32	Mr S Anstiss	Housing	<p>72 Respondent observes that all options concentrate on high density housing of smaller units. He feels that large detached houses for middle to high income groups need to be included to ensure the vibrancy of the economy through the contribution these types of families make. He requests relaxation of green belt policies for large houses based on three criteria + increased design specifications compared with other locations.</p> <p>The three criteria are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Road frontage housing only</li> <li>2) Infill development only (i.e. only on roads where the predominate criteria are detached houses)</li> <li>3) Detached family houses only</li> </ol>	<p>South East Plan housing provision can be made without using land in the Green Belt. A mix of apartments and houses can be provided in the urban area, in a more sustainable way than relaxing Green Belt policy in the manner proposed. The overall mix of apartments and houses likely to be built reflect the fact that 75% of the forecast increase in numbers of households in Surrey is 1 person households (1996 based projections).</p>
30	Mrs Doherty	Housing	<p>70 Objection to Westfield reserve site development and therefore implied rejection of Option 4. Grounds include loss of amenity to the area, lack of existing infrastructure to support such a development and potential risk to flooding and drainage</p>	<p>There are no overriding environmental or infrastructure constraints on development of this site. Any detailed issues will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD or a planning application.</p>
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Housing	<p>4 SCC notes that Option 1 is the only one in conformity with the structure plan. SCC is concerned that option 2 to 4 involve high density smaller apartments in WTC. They question whether there is long term demand for this kind of development and whether this will address affordable housing shortage for larger dwellings. Affordable housing on the long-term safeguarded sites should have regard for the need to create balanced communities. SCC stresses the need to demonstrate the deliverability and sustainability of the housing</p>	<p>There are no reliable forecasts of the level of future demand for apartments. However, the 1996-based household projections show almost 75% of the forecast increase in households in Surrey 2006-2021 will be one person households, which suggests that a strategy relying on a significant proportion of smaller apartments is realistic. New Government forecasts are expected imminently. These will provide more up to date data on this issue.</p>

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
			options proposed.	<p>The preferred option is in line with the rate of development set out in the draft South East Plan.</p> <p>The sustainability of the preferred option is assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The provision of affordable family housing will be addressed through the use of commuted payments from apartment schemes.</p> <p>Agreed that housing on the safeguarded long-term development sites should deliver balanced communities. This is compatible with the expectation of at least 60% affordable housing on these sites.</p>
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Housing	<p>33 Response in connection with extra care housing citing work that has already been done with WBC. A request is made to consider what are defined as Extra Care units over and above sheltered housing particularly in relation to the ageing Asian population. Work done to date has identified a need to reduce sheltered housing and develop a substantial number of Extra Care Units.</p> <p>A mix of social rented and leasehold (including shared ownership) is required.</p> <p>Philosophy of Extra Care is to provide a resource to the wider community of older people and others by co-locating other community services - Day Centres, GP Surgeries, Libraries and crèches on appropriate sites</p>	The Core Strategy does not make specific allocations or quotas for different types of housing. Any applications for extra-care housing will be considered against general location and development control policies as they relate to residential development.
23	RPS Planning	Housing	53 The responded does not believe that specific targets for	It is accepted that the provision of affordable housing

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				<p>% of affordable housing should be set. They subscribe to guidance 06/98 and PPG3 that has regard to individual site characteristic's as well as financial viability.</p>	<p>must have regard to site characteristics and financial viability. However, setting an overall target for the proportion of affordable housing required to meet housing need is appropriate. This will operate as a starting point for consideration of individual applications.</p>
23	RPS Planning	Housing	54	<p>Density figures for options 3 &amp; 4 are supported, rather than those in options 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Options 3 and 4 proposed slightly higher densities in the urban area outside Woking Town Centre than options 1 and 2. This was the least popular of the housing provision elements in the consultation response generally (notwithstanding this response), and is not needed to meet South East Plan provision. As a result the preferred option does not set it as a requirement. However, policy provides that, where appropriate in design terms, higher densities would still be permitted in those areas.</p>
24	RSPB	Housing	56	<p>RSPB objections to option 4 because of release of the reserve site at Brookwood Farm. Concern is raised about proximity to SPA with specific reference to Colony Bog &amp; Bagshot Heath SSSI and the rare birds that reside in this area. Research is cited regarding the effects of proximity to urban populations.</p>	<p>Site is more than 400m from the SPA (450m at nearest point) and as a result English Nature advice is that in principle mitigation of any effects should be possible. The Preferred Option provides for an open space buffer, as an extension to the Brookwood Canalside Country Park, to achieve this.</p>
28	Tourism South East	Housing	66	<p>Support is implied for options 3 &amp; 4 in providing affordable accommodation for those working in the tourism industry.</p>	<p>Note support for these options. Preferred option will permit release of safeguarded sites to provide for affordable and key worker housing, as proposed in Options 3 and 4, if insufficient sites come forward in the built-up area.</p>
29	Woking Chamber of Trade and commerce	Housing	140	<p>Agree that housing is an urgent priority and that affordable housing is vital to increase the standard of living of Woking residents.</p>	<p>Note support for provision of affordable housing as a priority.</p>

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Natural environment	113 Reference is made to the increased risk to flooding in Byfleet as a result of development. Sustainable drainage solutions are advocated.	Noted. Parts of Byfleet are in the area defined by EA as at risk of flooding. This risk is addressed by policy.  Sustainable urban drainage to be addressed by Generic DC policy.
2	English Heritage	Natural environment	18 The objective of leading on high quality sustainable developments and addressing climate change is welcomed  Recognition to protect & enhance natural & historic environments is supported (Spatial)	Note support.
2	English Heritage	Natural environment	19 Reference is made to the Policy Context in a number of areas: 1)EH are concerned that the section says little about environmental matters 2) The word Exceptional rather than very special circumstances should be applied to changes in Green Belt boundaries	1). The Policy Context for the preferred option has been extended to cover the key environmental policy context, while ensuring the whole section remains concise. 2). Noted. This will be corrected in the preferred option - as per PPG2 para 2.6.
3	English Nature	Natural environment	2 If development is to be focused near SPA/SAC sites this must be done within the requirements of the Habitat Regulations. All 4 options have the potential to impact on the SPA in terms of increasing recreational disturbance. Option 4 has the greatest impact potential as a result of the release of reserve sites. All options could trigger requirements for assessments under Habitat Regulations. Without clear spatial policies for SPA's regarding recreational disturbance the Core Strategy may not be implementable	The Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Plan will constitute the assessment which English Nature considers is required.
3	English Nature	Natural environment	21 The Basingstoke canal is sited as particularly important for bats. Parts of the canal are not SSSI designated but form ecological links between the two SSSI sections. All options present potential to develop along or near	The non-SSSI part of the Basingstoke Canal is identified as an SNCI. The policy protecting SNCI's will enable these concerns to be taken into account when determining planning applications.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				non SSSI sections decreasing bio-diversity. This is not adequately assessed in the potential impact of each option	
3	English Nature	Natural environment	96	In the context that Options 3 & 4 pose greatest threat to biodiversity reference to the Thames Basin Heaths policies must be made explicit within the core strategy and be cross referenced to a more detailed document (possibly an SPD). The Core Strategy that options 3/4 will need more mitigating measures needs to be followed by suitable policies within the LDF.	Agreed. Policy setting out the need for mitigation is to be included in Core Strategy. Detail will be included in a Supplementary Planning Document.
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	28	The sequential test regarding suitable sites for development should include flood risk criteria in the form of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	The Environment Agency has confirmed that a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is only required if land at risk of flooding is identified for development. The two sites safeguarded for long-term development are close to such areas, but it is intended that development would take place without building on any land identified by the EA as at risk of flooding. Therefore a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is not required.
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	29	The EA does not agree that statement about performance of the options stating that the two higher options may perform well on social and economic grounds but are likely to have the most impact on environmental sustainability	This is dealt with in responses to the Sustainability Appraisal.
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	30	As well as including references to protect and mitigate the effects on the environment the EA (with reference to PPS1) suggests that policies to enhance should also be included	Policy GDC6 specifically seeks opportunities to enhance biodiversity.
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	32	Concern that Options one and two by concentrating development around WTC may have an adverse affect	The non-SSSI part of the Basingstoke Canal is identified as an SNCI. The policy protecting SNCI's

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				on the green corridor along the Basingstoke canal.	will enable these concerns to be taken into account when determining planning applications.
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	103	Increased housing densities will make it more difficult to incorporate sustainable urban drainage into developments. This may increase the risk of flooding from surface runoff. However higher densities offer other opportunities for use of grey and rainwater.	This is a legitimate concern. The Core Strategy generic DC policy GDC1 Design will address the issue of sustainable urban drainage.
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	104	Option 3 As for option 1 & 2 together with specific concern expressed about the Moor Lane reserve site being close to the Flood plain. More intensive development at Byfleet business park may again increase the risk of flooding.	<p>Only a very small corner of the safeguarded long term development site at Moor Lane is within the area at risk of flooding as defined by EA. The development capacity of the site would not be significantly affected if this part was left undeveloped.</p> <p>The industrial areas of Byfleet within Woking Borough are not generally within the area at risk of flooding as defined by the EA. As a result their development capacity will not be affected by areas of flood risk nearby.</p>
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	105	Option 4 - reference is made to the Brook Farm site that may lie on the flood plain of the Stafford Lake Brook and the Crastock Stream.	Only a very small part of the safeguarded long term development site at Brookwood Farm is within the area at risk of flooding as defined by EA. The development capacity of the site would not be significantly affected if this part was left undeveloped.
10	Environment Agency	Natural environment	106	In all flood related matters the EA is recommending sequential tests of site suitability that include a flood risk assessment.	<p>The Environment Agency has confirmed that a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is only required if land at risk of flooding is identified for development.</p> <p>The preferred option does not identify any such land. As a result a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is not required.</p>

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
17	Local Agenda 21	Natural environment	48	LA 21 suggests that there must be a spatial relationship between designated sites to help migration and general biodiversity. Environmental practices that include gardens should also form part of this strategy.	Policy GDC1 addresses protection of natural resources on undesignated sites... Policy GDC6 specifically seeks opportunities to enhance biodiversity.
28	Tourism South East	Natural environment	63	TSE stresses the need to balance protection with the benefits that tourism brings to an area even if incomer generation to the provider and local services + employment is modest. Specific reference is made to flexibility in countryside development policies related to this kind of activity	The need to balance protection of the environment with socially and economically necessary development is dealt with through the Sustainability Appraisal.  The countryside in Woking is all Green Belt, where there are clear national policies as to what development is appropriate. The contribution of rural tourism to the local economy of Woking is very small, and insufficient to justify seeking to introduce flexibility in the LDF on this issue.
19	National Playing Fields Association	Open space	149	The NPFA would like to be involved in the preparation of LDD's and intends to provide a set of model policies for circulation. This will provide the essence of the NPAS representations at the preferred options stage. At the submissions stage the NPFA will check the contents of the document and comment as it sees fit.	Noted. No specific action required.
19	National Playing Fields Association	Open space	150	The NPFA are interested in involvement with the following documents: The Core Strategy Generic Development Control Policies SPD - Provision for outdoor sport - Provision for children's play - Planning obligations	Noted. No specific action required.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Open space	6	WBC approach on open space is supported	Noted.
24	RSPB	Open space	55	RSPB supports the provision of additional open spaces in any further development to avoid increase pressure	This is to be achieved through English Nature's Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Plan, and subsequent

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
			on existing national and international designated sites in the area, specifically The Thames basin SPA	SPD, linked to policy ENV1.
26	Sport England South East	Open space	59 Reference is made to open space and recreation and support give to the policy that covers all options. However they feel that contributions should be sought not just from large sites because all sites have an effect on demand for facilities. Reference is made to their guidance on provision (Planning Policies for Sport 1999) that is being updated currently to reflect PPG17. Reference is made to other guidance	The Core Strategy will include a generic DC policy GDC5 Planning Obligations that will address infrastructure provision. This will be supported by a SPD that is likely to require a tariff based approach to infrastructure provision that will be applied to all new residential developments.
27	The Garden History Society	Open space	60 Request that policies are adopted from the Local Plans and that policies are drawn up on English Heritage Register of Parks & gardens of Special Historic interest and other landscapes and parks	PPG15 requires local authorities to "protect historic parks and gardens when preparing development plans". Parks and gardens on the register in Woking are Brookwood Cemetery, Sutton Place and Pyrford Court. These are all in the Green Belt, two are in Conservation Areas and the third forms the grounds of a listed building. As a result they are protected in preparing the LDF. Their status as Protected Parks and Gardens is a material planning consideration through PPG 15, and no local policy is required.
28	Tourism South East	Open space	136 Water-based recreation LDF should encourage water-based recreation on the basis that they do not conflict with other recreational uses or harm residential or other amenity or the overall character of the area.	A generally permissive approach to water-based recreation (subject to green belt policies) will be included in the strategic location policy for recreation (LC1). Applications will also be determined against the Generic DC policies, in particular GDC1 Design.
2	English Heritage	Other	20 Point 3.15 (Woking Community Strategy) makes no mention of the quality of built and historic environment under the point about environment. EH requests that these matters are taken into account in the Community Strategy as it moves forward	Noted. This is a Community Strategy issue.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
6	Head of Spatial Planning, SEERA	Other	23 Acknowledges receipt of Core strategy but makes reference to RPG9 in preparing preferred options	Noted. The preferred option seeks to be in general conformity with the draft South East Plan parts 1 and 2.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Other	15 Minerals and Waste - SCC observe that there is little reference to waste and none for minerals. The Core Strategy DPD should have an explanation of SCC role and its requirement to produce a MWDF. Minerals and Waste allocations should be shown on the LDF proposals map. Policies are required to promote sustainable design, construction and demolition techniques. Recycling policies (incorporating into new sites) for minerals released from development sites should also be considered.	Reference to MWDF has now been made in the Core Strategy Introduction.  The requirement to include on the proposals map any minerals and waste matters including safeguarding areas, minerals consultation areas and any minerals and waste allocations which are in the adopted Surrey Mineral and Waste Development Framework is noted (as per PPS12 para 2.22). This will come into force once the MWDF has been adopted.  The policy requests will primarily be addressed by the Core Strategy policy GDC1 Design. However, it is not considered that a policy to require recycling of materials from waste could be justified.
28	Tourism South East	other	61 No specific comments made on LDF. A document was supplied advising on how tourism should be incorporated into LDF's. TSE has worked closely with SEERA on the recently updated RPG9	Noted.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Overall options	38 Support for option 1 or 2	Noted. The preferred option is a hybrid of individual components of the different options. The overall level of development is generally in line with Option 2, in terms of its objectives for the area represented by the Residents' Association.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Overall options	111 Grave concern that the options presented lead you to support the higher options without fully appreciating their implications. 1) There are only two references to Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford. With reference to West Byfleet there is concern that apartment development	Concern noted. The questionnaire response provides a broad brush response. The detailed responses to the Issues and Options report provide more detailed feedback. Both have been used in an appropriate way.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				and shops is of a density and size that would put substantial pressure on the infrastructure. No mention of the implications was made.	Pressure on transport infrastructure is an issue addressed in the choice of preferred option. The preferred option for density of development in West Byfleet centre reflects its role as a District Centre, but recognises the limitations of its public transport services.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Overall options	114	Concern expressed that response to the consultation questionnaire was poor. The respondent feels that few Residents are aware of the Core Strategy and do not realise its importance as a framework document.	The overall response to the magazine questionnaire was 600 responses. This response of under 2% is not unexpected for questionnaires of this type. The additional 600 completed questionnaires from the citizens' panel have resulted in a reasonable total response.  Further consultation will take place on the preferred option.
10	Environment Agency	Overall options	102	With reference to Core Strategy Objectives, EA say that the following reference to Green Belt conflicts with the green borough key priority statement. Open Green Belt land is not built on unless there is no other way to deliver key priorities.	The preferred option makes no proposals to release Green Belt land for development. However PPG2 identifies that very special circumstances can cause inappropriate development in the Green Belt to be permitted. The wording of the objective recognises this reality.
16	Humberts	Overall options	42	Options 3 and 4 should be favourably considered	Noted. The preferred option is a hybrid of individual components of the different options.
17	Local Agenda 21	Overall options	45	Support affordable housing elements of Options 3 and 4, but are concerned about environmental impacts. Therefore on balance support Option 2, but request further consideration is given to ways of securing more affordable housing particularly from the use of public land and by requiring more affordable housing on smaller sites.	The preferred option conforms to the South East Plan housing provision, which is based on strategic assessment of water supplies, and other environmental and infrastructure impacts. It is generally in line with Option 2 in its overall scale.  The preferred option seeks to reduce the size threshold for affordable housing, and requires higher

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
					percentages of affordable housing on the green field safeguarded sites. Other ways of maximising affordable housing are also being developed by the Council, not only s.106 contributions.
17	Local Agenda 21	Overall options	73	Concern is expressed that housing targets beyond SCC Structure Plan may tip the balance between housing need and the adverse affects of satisfying this in terms of congestion that feed back into social and economic objectives.	<p>The preferred option conforms to the South East Plan housing provision, which is based on strategic assessment of transport and sustainability considerations.</p> <p>The Surrey Local Transport Plan (LTP) aims to maintain peak hour traffic at 2005 levels over the next five years. Precise local measures to deliver this objective are not yet known.</p>
37	Mr Q.T Cross	Overall options	160	<p>Objection to any implementation of the "Core Strategy Issues and Options Report" on the grounds that the information reached the respondent too late because there was a distribution problem for the Woking Magazine in West Byfleet.</p> <p>Respondent recommends that the Council find a way of comprehensively canvassing local opinion before taking matters further.</p> <p>The Citizens Panel is not an alternative to public consultation.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Issues and Options report has served its purpose and a preferred option is now to be chosen. Further consultation will be carried out on this. This will provide the opportunity to canvass local opinion further, as requested by the respondent.</p> <p>Consulting the citizens' panel is a valuable part of the Council's overall consultation activities. It is not promoted by the Council as an alternative to public consultation.</p>
31	Mr Robert Weldon-Gamble	Overall options	71	Objects to options as he has no confidence in the Council's response to local needs.	Noted. Unfortunately the respondent has not made any specific points or suggestions, so it is not possible to address whatever concerns he has.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	86	Option 1 - This is in conformity with the Structure plan providing for housing to meet 2016 requirements primarily through use of previously developed land	The point regarding a 40% target is noted. This is also expected to be in the South East Plan London Fringe Strategy. As a result 40% affordable housing is the

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				particularly in and around the town centre. SCC suggests that the % of affordable housing on larger sites should/may be raised to 40% (Structure Plan Policy DN11) to take into account identified need, site availability and the economics of development on individual sites.	target in the Preferred Option.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	87	Option 2 - Housing provision is 40% above structure plan requirements. Concern is expressed that much of the current new build is sustained by town centre apartments that may not be sustainable over 10 years. A more balanced approach to provision in terms of size, and mix of housing types is stressed to better address need across the Borough	Noted. The preferred option is line with South East Plan housing requirement. However, it is true that this is likely to result in the majority of new homes being built as apartments. This is appropriate given the forecast rise in one-person households.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	88	Option 2 - The proposed level of affordable housing is supported but the Borough may wish to consider higher percentage requirements on larger sites. The use of commuted sums to support more family provision is supported. However any commuted sums that are used to buy existing properties will not contribute to the affordable housing (structure plan) target which is based on % of all new dwellings.	Noted. It is agreed that if the safeguarded long-term development sites are released these should provide a much higher proportion of affordable housing. The Preferred Option requires at least 60%.  The point re. acquisition of existing properties is noted. The Woking Housing Strategy has a target of 150 new build affordable properties per year. However, the Council has to apply a broad range of measures to secure affordable housing, and this can be one of the measures used.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	89	Option 2 On transport improvements, developer contributions will be expected.	The Core Strategy will include a generic DC policy, GDC5 Planning Obligations that will address infrastructure provision.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	90	Option 3 - Housing provision 72% above structure Plan. Concern is expressed as to whether this provision can be sustained by the market particularly with an emphasis on smaller town centre apartments.	Noted. The preferred option now assumes an annual rate in line with the draft South East Plan housing requirement. However, it is true that this is likely to result in the majority of new homes being built as

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				Affordable housing provision is supported but again a higher % on larger sites may be required.	apartments.  It is agreed that if the safeguarded long-term development sites are released these should provide a much higher proportion of affordable housing.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	91	Option 3 The release of land at Moor Lane for primarily affordable family housing could be justified by the scale of housing need. However should ensure a mix of housing types and tenures is expressed. Reference is made to structure Plan Policy DN10 designed to deliver a mixed and balanced community that is more accessible by public transport.	Agreed. A balanced community should be sought, but this can still involve at least 60% affordable housing.  Any need for public transport improvements to serve the site would be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD or a planning application.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	92	Option 3 - the increased housing provision + 7.2% rise in population will impact on Social and community infrastructure and could require more than just local improvements. Provision of additional family housing at Moor Lane will impact on education and health service provision.	The LDF evidence base has not identified any major forecast shortfalls in social and community infrastructure. The statement in the representation is imprecise, and the key issue is the extent of any impact. Surrey CC has not been able to provide any detailed information on this. The current Schools Organisation Plan identifies substantial surplus school places in the South Woking area although no data is provided for the post 2009 period. Surrey CC population forecasts show no significant rise in school age population in Woking.  Detailed issues can be dealt with at application stage.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	93	Option 3 - Transport improvements would require developer contributions.  Travel plans (as mentioned in the Core Strategy text) does not mitigate unacceptably located development in terms of public transport accessibility	The Core Strategy will include a generic DC policy, GDC5 Planning Obligations, which addresses infrastructure provision.  The point about travel plans is noted, but these can be part of the solution.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Overall options	94 Option 4 -As for option three with the addition of the second reserve site and resultant demand on transport and infrastructure	Response as for reps 90-93.  The current Schools Organisation Plan identifies substantial surplus school places in the Brookwood area although no data is provided for the post 2009 period. Surrey CC population forecasts show no significant rise in school age population in Woking.  Detailed issues can be dealt with at application stage.
22	Rapleys	Overall options	52 Rapleys on behalf of William Morrison Supermarkets PLC support Option 4 of the Core Strategy as a template for economic growth and housing provision and the resultant increase in retail floor space.	The preferred option conforms to the South East Plan housing provision, which assumes a 3% p.a. economic growth rate across the region.
36	Three Valleys Water	Overall options	153 TVW are keen to ensure that Woking's sustainability appraisal process is compatible with their 2004 Water Resources Plan.	Noted. Representations on the Sustainability Appraisal are set out in the separate Sustainability Appraisal report.
28	Tourism South East	Overall options	135 Inland Waterways LDF should promote policies that protect access to and support proposals for upgrading inland waterways and associated facilities for recreational use.	There is no need for a specific policy on access to, or facilities on, the Basingstoke Canal or Wey Navigation. Applications will be considered with reference to the strategic location and generic DC policies.
33	Miss. Elizabeth M. Ludovici	Retail	141 Objection to options that propose more retail development in West Byfleet. The objection is based on an observation that many of the smaller shop have gone over a period of time and that any development would involve pulling down yet more. The suggestion is to upgrade existing shops.	The evidence base indicates that there is the expenditure capacity for more comparison goods floorspace in West Byfleet. However, the Preferred Option focuses on Woking Town Centre, as the most sustainable place for major new retail development. Modest additional retail development would be permitted in the District and Local Centres, including West Byfleet, but is not a key target of the preferred option.
17	Local Agenda 21	Retail	80 1. LA 21 supports concentration in WTC as part of	1. Note support. The preferred option includes this. 2.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
				mixed use developments where access is best. 2. The market and farmers market in particular should be promoted to provide a choice of healthy food options and not domination by a few large supermarkets. 3. Need for local hubs is supported, linked to other local needs - e.g. shops, community health.	Noted. This is the Council's approach but is not delivered directly through the Core Strategy. 3. Preferred option identifies role of District and Local Centres as local hubs. However, some services are provided on a Borough-wide rather than local basis. The preferred option recognises this.
37	Mr Q.T Cross	Retail	159	Opposition to proposed additional retail floorspace at West Byfleet because it would overwhelm the existing infrastructure. Respondent asks "who wants it anyway?"	<p>Only a minority of respondents supported new retail development in West Byfleet, even among respondents within the primary catchment of the centre, whereas a clear majority supported new retail development in Woking.</p> <p>While the retail and commercial leisure study identified expenditure capacity to support up to 3,000 sq m gross of new retail, there has been no active developer interest in this proposal. As a result it is not a key component of the preferred option. If further retail development in West Byfleet is proposed in the plan period it will be assessed against the general locational strategy and policies of the Core Strategy.</p>
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Retail	5	DTZ study findings are supported with the need for concentration on WTC and some development in W Byfleet. They suggest that floor space development is clarified as being gross.	Noted. The preferred option focuses on Woking as the main opportunity for new retail development, although some increase in floorspace in West Byfleet or other district and local centres would also be permitted. The figures quoted in the Issues and Options Report are indeed all gross floorspace.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Social and community infrastructure	117	Comment is made that the report does not mention whether statutory service providers (education, police etc) will be able to cope with the rates of development proposed.	The Issues and Options report states that the Woking Social and Community Infrastructure Requirements Study has not identified any major shortfalls in social and community infrastructure which would prejudice the implementation of any of the options.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
				<p>However, statutory service providers do not make detailed plans for the 10 year period covered by the LDF. Their plans generally look no more than 5 years ahead. As a result local infrastructure needs will be kept under review, and developer contributions sought where required to meet any needs identified.</p> <p>Since the publication of the Issues and Options report research by Roger Tym and Partners for the South East Counties has indicated that forecast public expenditure from all sources will be sufficient to meet social and community infrastructure requirements from the level of new development proposed across the region.</p> <p>The preferred option is in line with the annual rate of housebuilding expected to be required in Woking by the draft South East plan. . This provides a sound basis for the view that any infrastructure deficits arising during the plan period will be capable of being addressed.</p> <p>Nb The Roger Tym study found a significant funding deficit for affordable housing and transport. This is dealt with separately in the Core Strategy.</p>
18	Mobile Operators Association	Social and community infrastructure	49 Reference is made to PPG8 and the need to include policies in LDF (LDD) that are criteria based. Criteria are suggested based on PPG8 principles. They are requesting that an overall policy be placed in one of the main LDD with supplementary guidance in another non	It is considered that a policy in the Core Strategy on this issue would simply repeat existing national policy in PPG8. Having regard to guidance in PPS12 it is therefore considered that a specific Core Strategy policy is not required.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
			statutory LDD	
21	Paul Dickinson and Associates	Social and community infrastructure	51 A request is made to consider provision for prisons in consultation with the prison service in view of current over crowding and that these sites are identified as part the DP process - Circular 03/98	Noted. This would be a matter for the Site Allocations DPD.
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Social and community infrastructure	14 The LDF needs to acknowledge that there are perceived deficiencies in education and health provision, although for Option 1 and probably Option 2 most needs at primary and secondary school could be expected to be met on existing education land.  Dependent on location and geographic spread of available places there may be requirements for developer contributions to cater for increased demand. Developer contributions may be required to support this.  Reference is made to SCC development of Children's Centres.  The LDF should acknowledge that much future development will take place on small previously developed sites which will not necessarily deliver s 106 agreements to ensure infrastructure keeps pace with development.	The preferred option, which provides for a level of new housing in Woking between Options 1 and 2, accords with expected housing provision for Woking is the draft South East Plan. On this basis the representation indicates that no new education land will be required.  Need for developer contributions, particularly from small sites, will be dealt with through Generic DC policy GDC5 and the Planning Obligations SPD.
7	Thames Water Property Services	Social and community infrastructure	24 Reference is made to PPS12 regarding infrastructure (in this case sewerage) provision for development. A request is made that provision for utilities is included in the LDF main objectives.	No change required. This is already covered in the "Provision of Key Services" objective.
7	Thames Water Property Services	Social and community	25 Reference is made to the fact that many sewerage utilities by their nature are located in Green Belt.	Applications for utilities development in the Green Belt will be determined using the criteria in PPG2. Given

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
		infrastructure		Provision need to be made for expansion or development of these to support new developments and resultant increases in demand. A core strategy policy should be included which allows essential utilities development in the Green Belt.	<p>the lack of any specific identified needs it is not appropriate or necessary to include any local interpretation of these criteria to cover utilities.</p> <p>Thames Water has not identified any specific need for new waste or sewerage capacity as a result of any of the options.</p> <p>However, there may be a possible need for an upgrade during the period 2010 - 2015. Further discussions will be held with Thames Water to identify the level of additional housing which may trigger this.</p>
7	Thames Water Property Services	Social and community infrastructure	100	Two policies and headings are proposed including: Water & Sewerage Infrastructure Capacity (in relation to specific developments) and Utilities Development.	<p>"Water and Sewerage Infrastructure capacity", the Core Strategy will include a generic DC policy, GDC5 Planning Obligations, which addresses infrastructure provision.</p> <p>"Utilities Development". The proposed policy wording is very general. Given that no specific need for new infrastructure has been identified by Thames water it is considered that the generic DC policies are sufficient to deal with any planning applications on this issue. It is recommended that this policy is not included.</p> <p>Thames Water has indicated no significant works are planned. However, there may be a possible need for an upgrade during the period 2010 - 2015. Further discussions will be held with Thames Water to identify the level of additional housing which may trigger this.</p>
7	Thames Water Property Services	Social and community	101	Thames Water require a three to five year lead time in the provision of extra capacity. Where a complete new	Noted. However, Thames Water has not identified any specific need for new waste or sewerage capacity as a

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
		infrastructure		water or sewage treatment works is required the lead in time can be between five to ten years.	result of any of the options.  However, there may be a possible need for an upgrade during the period 2010 - 2015. Further discussions will be held with Thames Water to identify the level of additional housing which may trigger this.
36	Three Valleys Water	Social and community infrastructure	154	Housing growth at regional development plan level has been built into TVW plans.  Secure water supplies can be provided to customers for some years to come. However in the longer term (post 2025) it maybe necessary to build a new regional water resource scheme in the South East.	Noted. The preferred option is in line with the South East Plan housing provision. As a result this response provides the Council with confidence that water supply will not be a constraint on development over the plan period at the levels proposed in the preferred option.
36	Three Valleys Water	Social and community infrastructure	156	It is important that Woking's LDF anticipates requirements to further optimise and extend water infrastructure.  Any updates would be welcome	Noted. Three Valleys Water will be kept informed of trends through the housing trajectory in the annual LDF monitoring report, and future phases of consultation.
36	Three Valleys Water	Social and community infrastructure	157	TVW are eager to understand at an early stage the likely centres of future residential and commercial development to anticipate water demand and the requirements for water infrastructure	Noted. Three Valleys Water will be kept informed of trends through the housing trajectory in the annual LDF monitoring report, and future phases of consultation.
28	Tourism South East	Social and community infrastructure	138	LDF's should make adequate provision for new or existing significant regional sporting venues to redevelop or expand in order to meet future needs.	Regional Planning Guidance identifies those areas in the south east which are suitable for significant regional sporting venues. Woking is not one of these areas. As a result this is not a topic the LDF needs to address.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Transport	37	Options 3/4 are rejected on the grounds that they will generate unacceptable traffic	The preferred option is based on Option 2. Providing transport infrastructure for the level of development in Option 2 is considered achievable by Surrey County

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
					Council in its representation. Detailed transport schemes and method of funding will be developed over the plan period, and will be kept under review.
13	Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford residents Assoc.	Transport	115	A request that planning officers and councillors should temper parking guidance when following Regional Planning Guidance with common sense.	Detailed matter to be dealt with in Parking Standards SPD.
4	Highways Agency	Transport	1	The HA makes the observation that in Transport Key Objectives (page 7) no specific mention is made of reducing the reliance on road based transport.	No change required. The Key objective for transport includes the aim that "Using a car is a choice not a necessity". This is the same as the point made by the respondent.
4	Highways Agency	Transport	22	The HA acknowledges and supports the use of the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study to inform the preferred option.	Noted. The results from Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study are awaited with interest.
4	Highways Agency	Transport	98	All options mention the need for a high level of investment in public transport but no such measures are in place. HA looks to see this developed at the next stage of the core strategy	Noted. This is a matter for the Local Transport Plan. The Core Strategy will include a generic DC policy, GDC5 Planning Obligations, which addresses infrastructure provision.
4	Highways Agency	Transport	99	Park & Ride - The HA in principle support such measures but stresses that their impact on the trunk road network need to be addressed. The HA recommends that P & R schemes should intercept existing journey routes rather than generating additional trips from other locations.	Noted. This is an option being tested by the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study. The results are awaited with interest.
9	Hockering Residents Association	Transport	27	Concern has been raised that none of the options guarantee provision for transport infrastructure to support development (especially options 3 and 4). Reference is made to difficulty in moving North to South across the railway lines. In addition, housing growth in the West linked with employment in the East is likely to increase congestion East to West	The preferred option is based on Option 2. Providing transport infrastructure for the level of development in Option 2 is considered achievable by Surrey County Council in its representation. Detailed transport schemes and method of funding will be developed over the plan period, and will be kept under review. Concern about movement within the Borough is noted.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
					Movement across the railway lines is a recognised bottleneck. The Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study is assessing transport improvements required to address forecast level of travel.
16	Humberts	Transport	44	Options for bus lanes on major routes, additional cycling and pedestrian provision + park and ride are all supported	All these options are being tested through the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study. The results are awaited with interest.
17	Local Agenda 21	Transport	76	There is objection to plans that include Woking as a transport hub in connection with airport growth (providing hotels etc) since such growth contributes substantially to carbon emissions. Concern is expressed that future government policy to curb CO2 emissions may impact on air travel projections	The provision of the Airtrack link to Heathrow will make surface access to the airport more sustainable by increasing the proportion of journeys by non-car modes. The Council considers that it is justified on the existing approved size of Heathrow, and should not be dependent on proposals for further expansion. The level of employment growth accommodated by the preferred option does not make any allowance for transfer of airport related development into Woking. However, any development at Woking linked to a sustainable link to Heathrow would itself contribute to a more sustainable pattern of travel to the airport.
17	Local Agenda 21	Transport	81	Support for walking & cycling followed by public transport. Concern is expressed that bus services remain poor in many areas. A suggestion is made to extend provision of Hoppa buses at peak times and in the evenings + improvements in pedestrian operated signals on main roads and edge of town locations. LDF should not give in to the car lobby	The Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study is testing a range of options to improve transport. The results are awaited with interest. The overall objective for transport seeks widespread access to good quality public transport, and safe walking and cycling routes.
34	Network Rail	Transport	142	Woking station operates adequately at present. However the growth envisaged may create pedestrian congestion at the station.  An additional staircase and new passenger facilities	The need for improvements to Woking station is agreed. The improvements proposed by Network Rail are the minimum required. The ideal solution is a new station and all modes interchange. This is what the preferred option seeks.

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
			<p>would be required. Woking, Brookwood and Worplesdon stations would require additional parking.</p> <p>These enhancements are required to accommodate growth. As a result pooling of developer contributions towards these projects should be required.</p>	<p>The Preferred Option identifies the potential need for additional parking at stations, where it results in an overall shift away from car use.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will include a generic DC policy, GDC5 Planning Obligations, which addresses infrastructure provision. In addition an associated SPD will be produced and will address the issue of pooled contributions.</p>
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Transport	<p>7 It is doubtful that the transport needs of options 3 and 4 could be met by 2016. It is possible that LTP2 and the longer term transport strategy within it would meet the transport requirements of Option2. There is no objection to Option 1 on transport grounds.</p> <p>Detailed transport requirements are being assessed through the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study (GWITS), but the results are not yet available. Major schemes emanating from GWITS (such as a new interchange facility at Woking station) are likely to take at least ten years to implement.</p> <p>The earliest date for operation of the Airtrack scheme would be 2011 at the earliest, but there is at present no guarantee of public funding, which could slow the process down further.</p>	<p>The preferred option is broadly Option 2 in terms of the level of housing, employment and retail provision. This representation backs that choice.</p> <p>Transport improvements described in the representation are a major component in facilitating future development in Woking, and the Council will work closely with Surrey County Council to seek to secure these.</p>
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Transport	<p>8 Caution is expressed on Park &amp; Ride schemes on economic and environmental grounds. SCC express the view that P &amp; R is only viable with restricted parking measures and increased parking charges in WTC</p>	<p>Noted. Park and Ride is one of the options being tested through the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study. The results are awaited with interest.</p>

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation	Council Response
			<p>otherwise such schemes become expensive overspill parking provision.</p> <p>There is concern that there may be a problem in finding a P&amp;R site that meets the sequential test of PPG2 and PPG13</p>	
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Transport	9 Options 3 & 4 promote development in parts of the urban area less accessible by public transport than Woking town centre. Development in these areas needs to enjoy frequent bus services (15-20 minute service with 7 day and evening operation) or can enable such provision. These need to be secured without private sector funding required in perpetuity.	<p>This is a challenging requirement. Apart from areas close to Route 91, hardly anywhere in the Borough meets this standard at present. Even quite large developments are unlikely to generate enough demand to attract a commercially viable service to this standard.</p> <p>A more basic standard of a 30 minute interval daytime bus service is a more realistic option. This is the one used in describing accessibility in the Preferred Option.</p>
1	Planning and Countryside Service, Surrey CC	Transport	10 Objection to Option A (page 3) that proposes increased road capacity for private cars because it encourages car use rather than reducing reliance. Journeys by car are contrary to sustainability objectives	Noted. This is one of the options being tested by the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study. The results are awaited with interest.
28	Tourism South East	Transport	67 TSE supports all initiatives that integrate transport across a range of modes maximising opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.	Noted. The preferred option delivers this through the focus on the interchange. More detailed proposals are a matter for the Local Transport Plan.
29	Woking Chamber of Trade and commerce	Transport	68 There is concern that option 4 will increase existing traffic problems which are already acute. There is general concern that current road improvement schemes are too long and drawn out and not well managed and planned. Road improvement schemes need immediate attention and plans for Victoria Arch should be brought forward at once.	<p>The preferred option is based on Option 2. Providing transport infrastructure for the level of development in Option 2 is considered achievable by Surrey County Council in its representation.</p> <p>Detailed transport schemes and methods of funding will be developed over the plan period, and will be kept under review.</p>

ID	Organisation Name	Subject	Representation		Council Response
					The Victoria Arch project is in the Surrey Local Transport Plan, but at present funding has not been secured.
29	Woking Chamber of Trade and commerce	Transport	69	Park & Ride scheme support with some subsidised public transport to encourage bus use	Park and ride is one option being tested by the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study. The results are awaited with interest.
29	Woking Chamber of Trade and commerce	Transport	139	<p>They request adequate parking for new buildings.</p> <p>They specifically state that more parking provision is necessary in the town - especially if Woking Station is to become a hub.</p> <p>Village centres also need more parking to keep them viable and encourage local shopping.</p> <p>Policies should be put in place to encourage use of office and other buildings parking spaces in the evenings and at weekends.</p>	<p>The Preferred Option identifies the principle of tighter maximum parking standards in and around Woking Town Centre. The detail will be dealt with through the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document, which will be the subject of a separate consultation.</p> <p>Additional parking in the town will generate additional traffic, and different solutions are being tested through the Guildford and Woking Integrated Transport Study. The results are awaited with interest.</p> <p>All village centres currently have some parking. The need for more would have to be thoroughly justified.</p> <p>Additional parking is provided in the Saturdays leading up to Christmas. However this policy is beyond the scope of the Core Strategy.</p>

## ORGANISATIONS WHO RECEIVED THE CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS FULL REPORT

- Adams Holmes Associates
- Architype
- Atis Real Wetheralls
- BBG Commercial
- Bell Cornwell Partnership
- Bellway Homes (South East)
- Blue Sky Planning Ltd
- Boyer Planning Limited
- Brimble, Lea and Partners
- CD HA/ Hyde
- CDC2020
- Charles Church Developments Ltd
- Charles Planning Associates Limited
- Charles Richards
- Churchods
- Cooper Environmental Planning
- Countryside Agency
- Countryside Properties
- CPRE Surrey
- David L. Walker Chartered Surveyors
- Development Planning Consultants
- Dickinson Dees
- Donnajane Whitcombe
- DPDS Consulting Group
- Dreweatt Neate
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- English Heritage
- English Nature
- Environment Agency
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Fairoaks Airport Ltd
- Fairview New Homes PLC
- Farley Lodge
- George Wimpey West London Ltd
- Gillenden Development Company
- Gleeson Homes
- Glen House Estates Ltd
- Goadsby and Harding Commercial
- Gordon Ellerington Development Consultants
- Government Office for the South East
- Guildford Borough Council
- H.B. Kingston Ltd
- Henry Smith
- Highways Agency
- Homewood Properties Ltd
- House Builders Federation
- Humberts
- Indigo Planning Ltd.
- Inventures NHS Estates
- Lacey Simmons Ltd
- Laing Homes Thames Valley Ltd
- Lennon Planning
- Level Consulting Ltd
- Lichfield Planning
- Local Agenda 21
- Local Dialogue
- London & Quadrant
- Malcolm Judd & Partners
- Matthews & Son
- Michael Shanley Group
- Mobile Operators Association
- Mole Valley District Council
- Montagu Land
- Mott MacDonald
- Mouchel Parkman
- MVA
- Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
- Network Rail
- Norman & Dawbarn
- Paul Dickinson & Associates
- Peacock & Smith
- Pincroft Housing Association
- Planware Ltd
- PRC Planning
- R Perrin Town Planning Consultants
- Rapleys
- Redrow Homes Southern Ltd
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Rippon Development Services
- RSPB
- Runnymede Borough Council
- South East of England Development Agency

- South East of England Regional Assembly
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Stewart Ross Associates
- Stonham Housing Association
- Strategic Rail Authority
- Surrey Business Enterprise
- Surrey Chambers of Commerce
- Surrey Childrens Service
- Surrey Community Development Trust
- Surrey County Council South-West Area Office
- Surrey County Council Spatial Policy
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Housing Association
- Surrey Police
- Tandridge District Council
- Taylor Woodrow Developments
- Tetlow King Planning
- Thames Valley Housing Association
- Thames Water Property Services
- The Guinness Trust
- The Planning Bureau Ltd
- Three Valleys Water PLC
- Tower Homes Ltd
- Transco
- Vail Williams
- Vincent James Homes Ltd
- Waterfall, Durrant & Barclays
- Waverley Borough Council
- West Estates Limited
- Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd
- Wilson Connolly Home Counties
- Woking BC Town Centre Manager
- Woking Chamber of Trade and Commerce
- Woking Community Support Team
- Woolf Bond Planning