

Mrs Crista Rayner  
203 Saunders Lane,  
Mayford,  
Woking,  
Surrey,  
GU22 0NT

Email: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Planning Policy,  
Woking Borough Council,  
Civic Offices,  
Gloucester Square,  
Woking, Surrey, GU21 6YL  
Email: [planning.policy@woking.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@woking.gov.uk)

Dear Sirs,

### **Re: Woking 2027 Site Allocations DPD Consultation**

I have been a resident of Mayford since 2006 and strongly object to the Council's proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary and the release of the land for development. These changes will have a major impact on Mayford and the surrounding areas.

Please find my comments and areas of concern below which apply to ALL proposed sites, GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11:

National Planning Policy Factors:

- National Policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances" – I haven't yet seen any information that clearly justifies development in the Green Belt in Mayford
- I would like to see any documentation that shows available brownfield sites and proof that all other sites than the Green Belt have been considered. All possible sites available for development within the borough should be considered, e.g. golf courses that might be closer and have better access to Woking Town Centre. At present, WBC has only considered sites owned by developers and not necessarily the most appropriate sites to develop (e.g. access to town centre, shops, medical facilities)
- Green Belt land in Mayford provides a fundamental separation of Woking and Guildford – development of the proposed Sites GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10 and GB11 is a precedence for further development, and will result in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford

Landscapes and Environmental Factors:

- Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs (Special Sites of Scientific Interest) and should have 400m buffers to protect them from encroaching development. Has this been taken into account before considering the land for development? Not only will the wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out, but also there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development. In addition, the increase of traveller pitches, will further affect these sites.
- Ten Acre Farm: over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area. Why should it be considered now?
- Land North of Saunders Lane GB11 includes Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance and therefore should not be considered for development. Why is this not being taken into account when considering possible development?
- Land North of Saunders Lane is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. During wet seasons, the land is saturated with water, providing flood relieve for houses along Saunders Lane. How will surface water be treated? What are the measures to deal with it if development goes ahead?

#### Infrastructure Factors:

- Saunders Lane is 1.2mi long, with no public transport, narrow road, few lampposts, missing footpaths, no cycle lane and a one lane rail bridge – I have not seen any documentation and/or study that puts in place possible traffic mitigation or improvements to cater for the additional use of the road by 500+ more dwellings and their respective vehicles.
- Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the forms of shops, medical centres, schools to support the new housing.
- Worplesdon Station is only accessible by vehicle. There are no pedestrian footpaths, is a very narrow road, accessible under/over one lane bridges – I have not seen any documentation or studies that take into account the difficulty to access the station and how to improve the infrastructure to cope with an increase use of the station.

WBC is proposing changes to the Green Belt boundary based on the recommendations of a Green Belt Review conducted by Peter Brett Associates. The methodology used to determine the most appropriate sites for release seems questionable. Is WBC going to release the land first, and then worry about how to cope with, for example, an inefficient infrastructure, flooding problems, overcrowding, loss of biodiversity, lack of facilities? Shouldn't we FIRST take into consideration and study the suitability of the land and follow National Planning Policy, provide detailed Landscape and Environmental Assessments as well as detailed Infrastructure Assessments, amongst others before even considering the release of Green Belt Land for development?

It has been a real challenge to find clear and concise information related to the Woking 2027 Site Allocations DPD Consultation. A complicated website, a large Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) difficult to read on-line, biased leaflets that read "WBC MUST, rather than SHOULD, identify and allocate sites to deliver housing, retail, office and warehouse space", and poorly presented Public Consultations with unclear displays of planning information undermines my confidence that the process to identify sites for

development has been thoroughly studied. I request a review of the existing information and methodology that identified the land to be released.

On these grounds I strongly object to the release of the Green Belt Boundary for development (Sites GB7, GB8, GB9, GB10, GB11).

The Site Allocations Development Plan will have a devastating impact on the Villages surrounded by the Green Belt.

Please also refer to the response by the Mayford Village Society who I am happy also to represent my views.

Yours sincerely,  
Crista Rayner