

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10247634348	A Cross	Previous comment	Noted
10180142275	Alan Cooke	None other than the previous comment.	Noted
10194078064	Alastair Emblem	In order to support the additional housing, the infrastructure in Farnham must be improved: more school places, better water supply, and improvements to the road system in the area e.g. a Western by-pass to provide relief for Wrecclesham and the town centre.	Infrastructure providers have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Surrey County Council as Highway Authority has no proposals for a Western by-pass which cannot therefore be included in the NP.
10208038452	Alethea Truin	There is insufficient allowance for social housing. Where is the plan to allow the right to build?	The provisions for affordable housing rely on the adopted Waverley Borough Local Plan - Part I.
10235408646	Amanda Broadway	In general, I endorse the approach that has been made to allocate brownfield sites for additional housing where possible, and within the built up area.	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10203249404	Andrew Blair	<p>I believe that it's essential to the future resilience of Farnham's appeal that the areas of open space, particularly around Farnham Park, Upper Old Park and those areas outlined in Map E are protected for the duration of the plan and that opportunities to build inside areas already allocated to the built-up sections of the town are maximised to further develop existing neighbourhoods. 5.86 is particularly important in protecting the character of Farnham's surroundings and natural environment for wildlife enjoyed by so many people who reside and visit the town. I support the proposed sites of 8-14 Old Park Lane, Folly Hill because it will deliver a better use of the current allocated land without having the dramatic impact on infrastructure, traffic, air quality and wildlife that is born from the Farnham Park West project. The reaffirmation of these risks and detriments are important to note when being considered in conjunction with the rest of 5.86 which provides a very strong response to the challenge of building new dwelling, whilst protecting from the erosion of the highly valued natural environments Farnham's residents remain proud of. Additionally, with the agreed renovation of East Street and Brightwells, the provision projected in the Housing Allocation 3rd Draft example aligns greater footfall for residents being able to be within a sensible, flatter walking / cycling distance of the new facilities along the route of the river, much more suitable for young families, the elderly and encouraging a greater volume of new residents make use of the easy access to new facilities. There is a reliance on car and bus travel from Folly Hill and Upper Hale currently and therefore there is an increased benefit for the environment and wellbeing of residents of the town in delivering dwellings nearer the course of the river. Finally, I believe that housing as many UCA students on the University Campus brings a huge benefit to there being more capacity within the local residential rental community. This area and the area around Cobgates should be developed with this in mind.</p>	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b></p>
10246283050	Andrew Jones	<p>There seems little point in making any comments on planning in Farnham since the Council, Waverley and its Planning Department seem abjectly supine to the demands of developers who seem to do what they like without any hindrance or sanction (and the massive over-supply of 1 and 2 bedroom flats in London will shortly be rejected here. Houses are what we need).</p>	<p>The NP Review will become part of the development plan to which Waverley Borough Council must refer in determining planning applications. Research shows that there is a need for smaller units in</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			Farnham to meet demand from newly forming household and younger families as well as older downsizing households.
10235313677	Andrew Neill	Development on Folly Hill has several problems. Because of the current developments in Sandy Hill and Folly Hill, the sewage system cannot cope and the last Winters with heavy rainfall has caused raw sewage in Farnham Park.	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b></p>
10226059216	Andy Meader	Please refer to separate Pegasus Group representation letter on behalf of Cove Homes, sent by email to the neighbourhood plan email address, as part of this submission.	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10210931351	Andy Turner	I don't have many comments, but I do want democracy to prevail. 88% of those who expressed an opinion/vote for the Neighbourhood Plan two years ago need to be reassured that that support counts for something. Farnham is a lovely market town. It needs regeneration in the East Street area. It would benefit from more student accommodation. However, it does not need little bites of less than affordable housing (£250K and upwards 'affordable' - really?) being rushed through, only to have the big housing federations muscling in through the back door. (i.e. 102 houses eventually built on Folly Hill after considerable local/ knowledgeable opposition, and repeated requests to provide that opposition)	Noted
10229259325	Bates	No Further Comments.	Noted
10223366835	Belinda Schwehr	My concern is to ensure that the water meadow OPPOSITE Coxbridge farm is not affected by draft plans to put 350 dwellings onto the Coxbridge Farm plot.	The proposal to allocate Coxbridge Farm for housing development has not changed since the made Neighbourhood Plan. The water meadow is protected as part of the town's green infrastructure (Map H) through Policy FNPI3.
10240183009	Bette Quinnell	So long as all building works are done on Brown field sites not Green sites.	Noted
10228559975	Brian Lowe	I am not convinced that the new SANGS Sites are sufficiently accessible or relevant to the new areas of residential development, against which they are needed / calculated. It is no good having them so far away that it needs a car trip to take the dog for a walk!	Natural England have stated that taking into account the capacity which will become available at the Tongham Road SANG (570 dwellings in total, after both phases are complete), there will be adequate SANG capacity available to deliver the proposed quantum of housing. In order to achieve SANG of a sufficient scale to attract dog walkers, it is expected that strategic provision will be required. In some cases it is accepted by Natural

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			England that access to these strategic sites will be by car.
10240083256	Carole Ottaway	We find it impossible to fill in this questionnaire, as we find it infuriating that you are forced to approve more developments in the area where the roads are in a bad state and not capable of taking the volume of traffic. Furthermore there are problems with schools, etc. not being able to cope with the number of people already living here. However that said, it would appear that the Council have tried to a make the best of the position they've been put in.	Infrastructure providers have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10245619947	Catherine	Please see my above comment.	Noted
10226974497	Celia Sandars	I have confidence that Farnham Town Council has done the best possible job in framing proposals to meet the extra housing demand imposed on the town.	Noted
10243069759	Charles Fearnley	Map E is such poor resolution on the survey that it's difficult to comment, Map G is OK, Map Q does not exist on page 44 This is poor, and doesn't encourage people to join in,	Noted <b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b>
10241175065	Charles Stuart	These proposals are good.	Noted
10248158870	Christina Buijs	Could Old Park be designated as a SANG to guarantee protection from development?	The owners of this area have not promoted Old Park as SANG during the Town Council's call for SANG sites exercise and the land is therefore currently not available for this purpose.
10246196730	Christopher Reeks	I object to the 125 dwellings suggested for Centrum Business Park, East Street as it would turn the whole area into a housing estate with Lidl in the middle with Brightwell's and the Woolmead, how would the infrastructure cope? I'm sure	Infrastructure providers, including Surrey County Council as Highway Authority, have responded in detail

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		much thought has been put into all this but I am far from convinced Farnham's infrastructure, particularly the road system can cope with these proposals.	to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Transport impacts will be judged by Policy FNP30. The Centrum site is well located in relation to the town centre and sustainable transport options.
10214664272	Claire Adie	<p>Housing Requirement - Waverley Borough Council Local Plan requires the neighbourhood plan to allocate an additional 450 dwellings as a minimum. If the neighbourhood plan fails to do so the Borough Council will allocate the shortfall in the emerging Part 2 Local Plan. The assessment has only identified 317 dwellings. At least 133 more dwellings need to be identified. The neighbourhood plan claims the net dwellings of 2,805 to meet the 2,780 housing requirement for Farnham over the plan period, however the neighbourhood plan does not evidence this figure. We raise serious concerns over the figures used within the table in paragraph 5.142. On the basis the neighbourhood plan has not disclosed how the figures have been calculated, a review of planning permissions for large sites with planning permission at 31st March 2018 highlights a large discrepancy between the stated figure and those registered on the Borough Council's website. Our review of the Committed Housing is set out in the table below:</p> <p>Net Dwellings Sites which have already been completed (in the period 2013/14 – 2017/18) 445 Large sites with planning permission at 31 March 2018 660 Additional housing capacity from Neighbourhood Plan housing allocations granted full planning consent after 31 March 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Western portion of Policy FNPI4 c) Land at Little Acres Nursery and south of Badshot Lea (WA/2018/0329 for 94 dwellings superseding WA/2015/1935 for 80 dwellings) 14</li> <li>• Policy FNPI4 h) The Woolmead (WA/2018/0458 for 138 dwellings superseding</li> </ul>	<p>The number of completions and planning permissions is sourced from Waverley Borough Council as Local Planning Authority. The completions and planning permissions should be listed in the FHLAA for clarity.</p> <p><b>Provide tables of completions and planning permissions in the FHLAA.</b></p> <p>The NP Review makes provision for at least 2780 dwellings in Farnham Parish during the Plan period.</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>WA/2015/2387 for 96 dwellings)                      42 Small sites with planning permission at 31 March 2018                      153 Windfall contribution                      363 Total                      1,677 The revised figure takes account of all planning permissions which are valid and permit 5 or more dwellings per site. Policy FNPI4c has also been calculated wrongly. Planning permission has been granted for 94 dwellings so this leaves a remaining capacity of 31 dwellings. A revision to the table in paragraph 5.161 is required. Taking account of the above the revised housing supply table should be as follows:                      Net Dwellings Sites which have already been completed (in the period 2013/14 – 2017/18) 445 Large sites with planning permission at 31 March 2018                      660 Additional housing capacity from Neighbourhood Plan housing allocations granted full planning consent after 31 March 2018: • Western portion of Policy FNPI4 c) Land at Little Acres Nursery and south of Badshot Lea (WA/2018/0329 for 94 dwellings superseding WA/2015/1935 for 80 dwellings) 14 • Policy FNPI4 h) The Woolmead (WA/2018/0458 for 138 dwellings superseding WA/2015/2387 for 96 dwellings)                      42 Small sites with planning permission at 31 March 2018                      153 Windfall contribution                      363 Housing Allocations                      933 Total                      2,610</p> <p>The implications on the overall housing provision means the neighbourhood plan has a total shortfall of 170 dwellings. The NPPF 2018 came into force on the 24th July 2018. The NPPF introduces a standardised housing calculation which means determining the Objectively Assessed Housing Need will follow a fixed methodology used across England. This element comes into force on 24th January 2019, however it is possible to use the methodology to forecast what the OAHN will be. We have undertaken this process for Waverley which shows that the OAN will increase from 590 dpa to 643 dpa. Such a significant increase means that Waverley would FAIL the Housing Delivery Test, which is also a new tool within the NPPF. The borough will FAIL ‘SUBSTANTIALLY’ with a percentage of</p>	

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>45%, meaning an immediate 20% buffer will be applied to the 5-year housing land supply. In compliance with the WBC Local Plan Part I, the Borough Council will require the main settlements to take some of these additional housing numbers. Farnham is one the least constrained settlements so will have the land capacity to take more housing. To further compound this, the remaining HMA authorities are also set to see significant increases in their OAHN. Woking will increase from 292dpa to 409dpa. Guildford will increase from 654dpa to 823dpa. The whole of the HMA is forecast to FAIL the Housing Delivery Test, meaning there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development in 2020. Waverley has already had to take some of Woking's housing due to major land constraints, as such it is very likely Waverley will be called upon again to take some additional housing from Woking. The neighbourhood plan in its current form will in 2 years' time require another review in order to address the housing shortfalls. Therefore in order to safeguard the plan and defend Farnham from speculative planning applications, we strongly urge the neighbourhood plan to allocate further housing sites. The neighbourhood plan needs to provide 2,780 dwellings which currently it fails to do so, but rather than doing just the absolute minimum, the plan should allocate further suitable housing sites. This is proactive and positive plan making. Please note a PDF copy of these comments have been sent to <a href="mailto:neighbourhood.plan@farnham.gov.uk">neighbourhood.plan@farnham.gov.uk</a> which would address the format issues.</p>	
10173362461	Cliff Watts	<p>The whole process should not be necessary. It seems totally illogical to place 450 of the unmet need for houses in Woking in Farnham and implies Surrey exists in isolation and Hampshire does not exist at all!!!</p>	<p>It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.</p>
10232981916	C W Wicks	<p>Farnham is full. Roads are full, schools are full, health facilities are difficult. Pollution is above the limit. I could go on and on. Farnham is full</p>	<p>Infrastructure providers have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development</p>



General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10245158032	D Stokoe	No particular comment except that increasing the population in Farnham will reduce the present pleasant atmosphere in the town and the historical context.	Noted
10245106064	Daniel Lamdin-Whymark	Greenfield sites should be avoided where possible. In particular the greenfield cemetery site contains wooded area which provides habitat to wildlife including bats and development would be impactful.	<p><b>Policy FNP14 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNP14 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b></p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery</b></p> <p>The site is not currently served by a suitable vehicular access. The site is constrained by a number of trees and has capacity for a limited number of dwellings. Achieving a suitable access to such a small development is likely to prove problematic and the Town Council proposes to delete this potential housing option.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery site.</b></p>
10248722237	Dave Carter	Nothing additional to what I stated in my comments on choices for the various identified sites.	Noted
10229123802	David Balfour	Policy FNPI I Preventing Coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot; Badshot Lea and Weybourne; Rowledge and Wrecclesham; Rowledge and Boundstone and Rowledge and Frensham - This is very important to prevent speculative developers from running roughshod over existing residents' views to maximise profit, to preserve distinctions between towns and villages and, crucially, for conserving what nature and bio-diversity within the area. Waverley's poor record of house building over the last 20-30 years is lamentable but that shouldn't mean a free reign for developers on the excuse of playing catch-up.	Noted
10247808375	David Brinton	I think Farnham Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan team have done a fantastic job in preparing this in extremely difficult circumstances. Thank you.	Noted
10205640808	David Davies	No comment except that it should be adopted and furthermore that Waverley should not be able to allocate more housing in the life of this plan. The residents of Farnham supported this plan and it should therefore be honoured.	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10166776863	David Howell	I support the comments submitted by The Farnham Society	Noted
10235995247	David Kershaw	Pages 58/59 Policy FNP14 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane (Gross Area: 0.95ha. Approximate density: 15dph. Approximate capacity: 10 dwellings) The statement that access should be taken from Upper Old Park Lane but there may need to be some improvements to both the surface, if followed, will be detrimental to the large PROTECTED oak trees which line the lane. Additionally, changing the surface of the lane will remove its rural nature that is one of the main attractions to walkers, ramblers and horse riders.	<b>Policy FNP14 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010. <b>Delete Policy FNP14 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b>
10246267459	Dawn Thacker	I am part of the Consortium and our site is not deemed suitable for no good reasons. Our application is on pages 56 and 57 and meets all the requirements for a sustainable development.	A large number of sites have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLAA this site is not considered to be suitable.

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10249608160	De Richards	The infrastructure leaves a bit to be desired with all these buildings. FPH is too small to cope. The bypass causes more problems especially as they are closing one lane 1st Oct for how long. Wrecclesham needs a bypass and clearer signs for buses as they always get stuck cos they can't read.	Infrastructure providers have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Surrey County Council as Highway Authority has no proposals for a Western by-pass which cannot therefore be included in the NP.
10249554073	Deborah Anne Childs	Social housing is very important	The provisions for affordable housing rely on the adopted Waverley Borough Local Plan - Part I.
10226102725	Diana Small	Concerns regarding infrastructure provided by Surrey - re schools, doctors and roads.	Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10231369737	Dorothy Winifred Ann Crittenden	No comments	Noted
10209471256	Dr Dorothy Davidson	I strongly support the draft Farnham Neighbourhood Plan Review and believe further housing should be located amongst existing built areas rather than on	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		green field sites around Farnham, protecting the valuable nature resources we have in this area of outstanding natural beauty.	
10223410901	Dr John Mann	No comment	Noted
10181389796	Dr M.A. Coombes	The amendments are very minor and should be allowed to be incorporated in the Plan without a referendum.	Noted
10188005009	Ellis	Our Farnham Neighbourhood Plan is good and the boundaries are good and all green belt land should be respected. Further proposals should be on brownfield sites.	Noted
10238792303	Gemma	I would prefer to see the AGLV south of Upper Old Park Lane to be extended west to cover the section across the Old Park Lane bridleway, since this is a popular walking and riding route where the views and natural surrounding either side of the bridleway is much valued.	The AGLV is a Local Plan designation which will be reviewed by Waverley Borough Council. The landscape designations in the Neighbourhood Plan are based on the Farnham Landscape Character Assessment, 2018.
10221080367	GP Mitchell	The proposed new SANG sites as described on pp43/44 are some distance from the majority of housing in Farnham. This will require a car journey to reach it. A greenspace ought to be within walking distance of the housing it serves.	Natural England have stated that taking into account the capacity which will become available at the Tongham Road SANG (570 dwellings in total, after both phases are complete), there will be adequate SANG capacity available to deliver the proposed quantum of housing. In order to achieve SANG of a sufficient scale to attract dog walkers, it is expected that strategic provision will be required. In some cases it is accepted by Natural England that access to these strategic sites will be by car.

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10247270079	Greig Marshall	The proposed areas in and around Badshot Lea present a clear risk of congestion, pollution and over population that could highly strain local amenities. The village is already highly congested and more houses in any part of the village would further aggravate the situation. The provisions for better roads and local facilities is simply not enough. P 102 Land at Little Acres Nursery and south of Badshot Lea is especially of concern as this is the primary route from Guildford into the village and is already not efficient. P101 a) Part of SSE Farnham Depot, Lower Weybourne Lane and adjoining land and P101 b) Land west of Green Lane, Badshot Lea are also risking serious over congestion.	There are no additional housing allocations at Badshot Lea within the NP Review. Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council as Highway Authority have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10240097752	Hans Dumoulin	Strongly support the philosophy behind the Neighbourhood Review.	Noted
10242619309	Heather Hill	What is Farnham taking more houses when Godalming and Haslemere has lots of space!!! I object to the number of houses going in to small places. Be more considerate of the long term effect on the town and the environment!! Prefab houses like the ones by Tesco's at Langhams rec are a disgrace to the landscape. Agree there needs to be houses but in all locations they can be more set back from the road and done more tastefully!! The plan needs to be stronger regarding what can be allowed - yes we need new homes but not as many pop up cardboard looking houses as you can shove in to a space. Please can the rest of Surrey take more homes and not always Farnham! The infrastructure couldn't cope 10 years ago and it can't now! Health, schools! Roads!!! It's clogged up! Please be more forward thinking. I'd the neighbourhood plan was agreed it's not fair to just keep changing it and rely on residents partitioning and completing surveys! Please stick with what was agreed and stop messing around and adding more!	It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan which prescribes that Farnham should accommodate at least 2780 dwellings up to 2032. Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10194382693	Heather Simpson	The approach to Farnham coming in from the Coxbridge Farm roundabout along West Street is a good entrance to the town showing its rural roots and its market town nature. Concentrated development along this piece of road will spoil the nature of the town. This is already a very busy, congested road and any further traffic coming out onto this road will make it even worse and cause a poor introduction to the town architecture. Rain runs off the fields after heavy downpours and covering the land will make this worse.	The proposal to allocate Coxbridge Farm for housing development has not changed since the made Neighbourhood Plan. Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10248668214	Helen Butcher	FNP30 The section on transport and infrastructure states an objective of reducing air pollution due to traffic. However the policy, alongside the proposed town centre development sites will not achieve this. Air pollution is already above designated limits. This means that traffic generation does not need to be significant to make matters worse, any increase will make the air pollution worse. This cannot be addressed with travel plans, it can only be addressed by restraining further development inside the town centre area. The policy does not meet the objective.	Proposals will need to be assessed against Policy FNP30. Sites within or close to the AQMA are well located in relation to the town centre and sustainable transport options.  The promoters of the Centrum site (the only site abutting the AQMA) have submitted an Air Quality Impact Assessment This concludes that the change of use of the site from commercial to residential will contribute to a reduced impact on air quality with in the Farnham AQMA. The amount and nature of traffic to be accommodated on site can be successfully managed to reflect the Air Quality Management Plans objectives. There will be a

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			<p>significant decrease in the number of heavy goods vehicles and diesel-powered vans visiting the site and provision for electric vehicle charging points within the under-croft parking areas will encourage private car owners to switch to less polluting electric / hybrid vehicles. The requirement for electric vehicle charging points to mitigate the impact of the development through future use will be embraced within the scheme and as part of an agreement between Surrey County Council and Surrey Borough Authorities. Other sites are close to, but not within, the AQMA and have greater opportunity to avoid adverse impacts on the AQMA than greenfield sites at the edge of town which are likely to require car travel in or through the AQMA to access employment, rail services, the town centre facilities etc.</p> <p><b>Add the requirement for electric vehicle charging points within the scheme to mitigate the impact of the development through future use to the Development Guidance (Access section) of Policy FNPI4 m) Centrum Business Park.</b></p>



General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10248206606	Helga Parker	I strongly support the saving of any green spaces left in Farnham, especially in the more built up areas - we (humans) and wildlife desperately need them, even if they are just small parks, gardens, etc.	Noted
10246337331	Hugh Hall	I strongly support the plan and the methodology used to produce it. To be able to provide additional homes on top of the already agreed Neighbourhood Plan within the existing building boundary and retaining the character of the surrounding villages is a significant achievement. It is of course crucial that the issues with the transport infrastructure in Farnham Town are resolved in conjunction with the proposed developments. This document is the first holistic approach I have seen to resolving all of the existing issues with transport, infrastructure, town centre amenities at the same time as creating close to 3000 new homes over the planned period. I fully support the approach. My only concern would be the ability of the planning authorities to control and monitor the significant development that will take place over the next 3 years in Farnham Town Centre, whilst controlling the other housing development. The recent case of Bewley Homes removing Trees without consent in Wrecclesham is indicative of the problems that will be posed by developers.	Noted.
10246313915	Ian Burgess	The Town Council has been forced into a difficult position and, overall, the plans appear to make the best of this. I hope the amenity and the reasons residents of Farnham enjoy living in our town are not ruined as a result of other local towns and boroughs not taking responsibility for the need to build housing. Please, please ensure planning committees take full advantage of all means available from developers and Government to improve the infrastructure in our small town. Broadly navigation of the documents listed in this questionnaire could be made easier and links would have been ideal.	Noted.
10246793365	Ian Jacob	I welcome the sensitivity with which the plan attempts to maintain the character and style of Farnham. I particularly think that this depends on excellent architecture as well as careful long term strategic planning. I am supportive of the emphasis on high quality and sensitive design that is included in the plan.	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10240060121	Ian Wallace	If an additional 450 homes are to be built in the Farnham Area, then 'Brownfield' sites should be chosen before any other. We think that the Cobgates sites; Kimbers Lane site; Green Lane Cemetery land; Comley Reclaim site should be considered first. We have objections to the Centrum Business Park (already crowded) as it would disrupt the Hospice Shop & Collecting centre. And many thanks to Carol Cockburn for her persistent work for Farnham!	Noted.
10166258162	James Blandford	Broad support for the plans Also very pleased that Farnham Town Council is taking this proactive approach.	Noted
10228683445	James Blandford	The updated plan gets my support.	Noted
10194385707	James Rose	No comments.	Noted
10248501291	Jane Georghiou	I am surprised at the support for the 10 dwellings north of Old Park Lane as I think this would increase the chances of the large development south of Old Park Lane going ahead.	<b>Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010. <b>Delete Policy FNP14 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b>
10202418685	Jane Horne	I strongly resent that Farnham may have to take some of the building allocation from Woking. Farnham has a lot more character and beauty than Woking so there is a lot more to be ruined. The town is set to increase in size with the Brightwell development - which could turn out to be a catastrophic waste of money and retail disaster. There should be a limit to how large the town becomes.	It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.
10204486842	Jason Griffiths	A good plan	Noted
10248812611	Jayne Hooper	Whilst I appreciate there is an ever increasing demand for additional housing throughout our community, the volume of both current and proposed development is illogical. There appears to be little thought given to the impact on infrastructure - our rural roads simply don't support the volume of traffic we have at present, let alone when all proposed developments are complete. Traffic queues and journey times are horrendous and this is undoubtedly going to deteriorate even further. There are no traffic calming measures / speed restrictions in place, (with the exception of community speedwatch initiatives), to ensure the safety of local residents and motorists, particularly in built up areas such as Wrecclesham /Sandrock Hill/Shortheath etc. where developments are prevalent and there are known issues with motorists travelling at excessive speeds, including HGV's. The significant increase in development, coupled with the location of a number of the proposed sites will have a devastating impact on our local environment in terms of overall pollution levels and the negative impact on nature and wildlife, and diminishing greenspaces - reasons a significant majority of local residents choose to live here in the first place. In addition to the above mentioned reasons for expressing concerns and opposing these developments, is the fact it is currently almost impossible to secure a doctor's appointment in under 3 weeks, and the demand for school places, particularly secondary, appears to spiral further out of control year on year.	It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan. Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council as Highway Authority and the North East Hampshire & Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group in relation to doctors have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10184151054	Jeffrey Hogg	very supportive of plan	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10248600375	Jennifer Notermans	The plan has been carefully and thoughtfully devised to maintain, as best possible, the unique character and ambience of the general Farnham area given that further house building is required.	Noted
10244273705	Jenny	Leave the green land alone. Nature needs it more than we need more housing.	Noted
10233203819	Jenny Daniels	No	Noted
10246138957	Jess-Mary Jones	The densities proposed for the areas within the already built-up parts of Farnham are too high. The infrastructure serving the town and town centre is already under strain e.g. traffic, parking, schools, GP surgeries, Council services - collections, rubbish clearance etc. Presumably flats are planned for the Cobgates and business park sites. Where is the demand for these coming from - small two and three bed houses would surely serve people better. There has to be some sensitivity in forthcoming plans for instance Cobgates is on the edge of the Farnham Conservation Area and the numbers of dwellings anticipated cannot but impinge on this.	Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council as Highway and Education Authority and the North East Hampshire & Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group in relation to doctors have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Research shows that there is a need for smaller units in Farnham to meet demand from newly forming household and younger families as well as older downsizing households.
10246370186	Joan Anniballi	Some maps could be clearer in the plan.	Noted <b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b>
10180222114	John Ely	No	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10226709046	John Fraser	No adverse comments at all. I think the FNP is an admirable attempt to contain the pressure to develop housing in an unrestrained manner and thus maintain the quality of life in the town and its immediate surroundings. I congratulate and thank all those involved in its compilation and I also congratulate those who assembled the necessary revision so swiftly.	Noted
10249527409	John Overton	Respect wildlife, respect heritage.	Noted. The NP Review seeks to continue to do this.
10202836517	Jon Liddle	Inserted maps are very difficult to read.	Noted <b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b>
10214664135	Joseph Michel	<p>Certificates of Lawfulness too often make a mockery of Planning law and the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan. They are tick-box assessments that ignore Environment Agency regulations, the Farnham Plan, the Farnham Design Statement, Surrey Wildlife Trust and Local neighbourhood opinions. They are a silent treat to householders as local people are never alerted to the applications. No peaceful homeowner wants to be forced to check on these 'hidden planning applications' every week of the year. Checking weekly has become a necessity - this is wrong and stressful. Article 4 directions should be applied to sensitive areas. At 3.1 in the 2012 updated Appendix D to Department of the Environment Circular 9/95 General Consolidation Order states: 'Provided there is justification for both its purpose and extent it is possible to make an article 4 direction covering any geographical area from a specific site to a local authority wide'. Furthermore, at 2.3 under The Use of article 4 directions it states that article 4 directions can be used if a Certificate of Lawfulness has 'A direct and significant adverse effect in a flood risk area, flood defences and their access, the permeability of ground and management of surface water or flood risk'. Please note 'Flood Risk Areas'.</p> <p>2.07 Flooding has been experienced in recent times as well as in the past - Flooding occurs far too often in Frensham Vale. The scheme along the River Wey and its tributaries implemented in the early 1970s has NOT always been effective.</p>	<p>In law, certain developments are permitted without the need for planning permission and cannot therefore be influenced by planning policy. Article 4 designations are a matter for Waverley Borough Council outside of the neighbourhood planning process.</p> <p>No housing allocations are proposed within the floodplain and Policy FNPI requires development to not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding itself, and not to result in any increased risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>The SPA is covered in Policy FNPI2 and the NP Review proposes two additional SANG sites.</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>See <a href="http://www.frenshamvale.info">www.frenshamvale.info</a> images and videos of flooding. We 100% agree that development must take account of potential flood risks and displacement to other sites.</p> <p>2.43 Thames Water intent on carrying out odour improvement works at Farnham Sewage Treatment Works (STW) in the current business plan period 2015 – 2020. Sainsbury's Carpark smells badly of sewage and has done so for the last 10 years! Please accelerate progress.</p> <p>4.03 In accordance with the NPPF, the greenfield sites And Garden Grabbing must avoid areas at high risk of flooding especially Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (and potential extensions to the AONB). 5.23 Farnham has a history of flooding - we agree that the effects of climate change have increased over the last 10 years especially. The frequency and severity of flooding has increased. NPPF should regulations should be strengthened where inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding are submitted - they 'must' be avoided. Certificates of Lawfulness must never override this NPPF criteria as it has at one particular site in Frensham Vale. Flood zones 2, 3a and 3b (the functional floodplain) should apply to all parts of the Neighbourhood Plan area. We support Neighbourhood Plan Review in seeking to avoid development in areas with the highest risk of flooding. After 2032 this should be reviewed again when flooding events will have inevitably increased across Farnham due to increased housing development.</p> <p>5.118 New residential development must also apply to Certificates of Lawfulness when it has a significant adverse effect on the ecological integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) Avoidance Strategy, will never work if a single site is ignored - simply because all species roam - animals do not adhere to single development site boundaries as implied under Policy NRM6, 'developments of fewer than 10 dwellings'. We understand the temptation to assess solely 'the site' to reflect the recent Sweetman European Court of Justice ruling (Case C 323/17 - People Over Wind and Sweetman 2018) relating to the Habitats Directive and understand the imperative for Waverley Council to review its decision-making processes in respect of new dwellings within the Buffer Zones of the Wealden Heaths and Thames Basin Heaths SPAs. This Assessment forms a key</p>	

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		element along with the council liaising closely with Natural England to ensure decisions made by the council in these areas are lawful and to avoid the possibility of legal challenge. In this instance, one house in Frensham Vale cannot be assessed in isolation to the surrounding area because it forms a key section of the Wildlife Corridor 04. Please read full input from FVAG here <a href="http://www.frenshamvale.info">www.frenshamvale.info</a> (top section of right hand column) 'Natural England Assessment Input'. Thank you for undertaking this review. Joe Michel For and on Behalf of FVAG	
10207394567	Julie	This is a good plan, well done.	Noted
10223914043	Julie Last	Land south of Badshot Lea WBC Ref 381 I am disappointed that our site has been rejected as in the Landscape Sensitivity and Value Summary it scored 14 (slight) and was one of 3 lower scoring sites, it comes with its own SANG and would contribute greatly to the housing shortage in Badshot Lea and offered a mix of affordable housing and a range of other amenities which would enhance the village.	A large number of sites have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLLA this site is not considered to be suitable.
10221853525	Julie Russ	Unfortunately it was not possible to read the detail on Map E, (page 37) or the legend, even when enlarged. Therefore, although I have commented, I am not sure if I agree with it or not. I sincerely hope that the permanent green space above the Hop Fields development is not within the built up area of Farnham, and also the field at the rear of Three Stiles Road is also outside the built up area. If this is not the case then I do not agree with the built up area boundary. I also hope that the fields above the Hop Fields development are in the AGLV. I do not know because it was impossible to locate Crondall Lane or any other roads on the fuzzy map.	Noted <b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b>  Land to the rear of Three Stiles Road is not allocated for housing development and remains outside the Built Up Area Boundary.
10232334618	Julie-Anne Flude	I agree in their choice of brownfield town sites over unnecessary over developed and high density building on greenfield sites wherever possible.	Noted
10229328694	J W	Stop building in Badshot Lea where the roads already struggle with the volume of traffic	There are no additional housing allocations at Badshot Lea within the NP Review. Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council as

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			Highway Authority have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10237362529	K Tijou	Again - the poor quality of the maps mean it is virtually impossible to comment.	Noted <b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b>
10185949773	Karen	I totally object to using green space for housing.	Noted
10248300976	Karen Bayley	I am unable to comment on the previous question regarding the areas of high landscape value because the map on p 37of the document is not sufficiently legible (on the website). I am unable to respond to the question on SANG sites because I do not feel that I have sufficient knowledge of the planning system or planning law. Nor, given my work and family commitments, do I have sufficient additional time to read the 125-page Neighbourhood Plan and the 116-page Housing Land Availability Assessment.	Noted <b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b>



General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10247710629	Karen Cobbett	<p>However, Site NP Ref N (8,10,12,14 Upper Old Park Lane) SHOULD NOT be included as it clearly contravenes the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan, as demonstrated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site NP Ref N contravenes page 34 as follows: “The Neighbourhood Plan Review seeks to retain the landscape character of the areas of high landscape value and sensitivity, as shown on Map E, and to avoid allocating sites for development in these areas.”</li> <li>• Site NP Ref N contravenes page 36 as follows: “There has been a small incursion of residential development into this historic landscape west of Folly Hill along Old Park Lane/Heathyfields Road. Nevertheless, the rural character of Old Park is characteristic of North West Farnham (Farnham Design Statement, 2010) and should be retained for its historic interest; its sensitive landscape; its contribution to the setting of the collection of Grade 1 and 2 listed buildings at the Castle; its recreational value and biodiverse habitats. This area forms part of the adopted Local Plan’s Area of Great Landscape Value. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to avoid allocating sites for development in this area.”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b></p>
10229880646	Lesley Swann	<p>Obviously the use of brown field sites p44 is of the utmost importance. P73 outlines the use of cemeteries as outdoor green spaces and says "it is important to maintain the current amenity greenspaces". Why therefore are we talking about building on the Green Lanes cemetery site? P74 "In order not to make the existing poor provision worse, it is important to maintain the existing provision for Children and young people.</p>	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery</b></p> <p>The site is not currently served by a suitable vehicular access. The site is constrained by a number of trees and has capacity for a limited number of dwellings. Achieving a</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			<p>suitable access to such a small development is likely to prove problematic and the Town Council proposes to delete this potential housing option.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery site.</b></p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10205688177	Linda Williamson	Only as commented above on Folly Hill proposed development.	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b></p>
10234070842	Livermore	FNP ref. N Folly Hill, Upper Old Park Lane Folly Hill; 1. This directly contravenes the recently adopted Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (rev. reg. 14) sections 5.86 & 5.92; 5.86 - to retain the landscape character of the area and high landscape value & sensitivity, to avoid allocating sites for development in these areas 5.92 - the rural character of Old Park is characteristic of north west Farnham (Farnham design statement 2010) and should be retained for historic interest, its sensitive landscapes, its contribution to the setting of the collection of Grade 1 & 2 listed	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>buildings at the castle, its recreational value and biodiverse habitats. The area forms part of the adopted Local Plan's Area of Great Landscape Value. The neighbourhood Plan Review seeks to avoid allocating sites for development in this area. 2. is located on Upper Old Park Lane with is an unadopted unmade single track lane, barely maintained and in a fragile state, not suitable for expansion as it cannot be widened or provided with footpaths or brought up to highway standards, its junction with the A287 on the brow of hill opposite the busy Folly Hill housing development is already a hazard and would lead to an incredibly dangerous road layout with increased vehicular &amp; pedestrian traffic. 3. Even if point 2 could be resolved the road is unadopted and not under the control of the local council. 4. The negative effects that would result to both ours and neighbouring properties on the south western side of the A287 are significant &amp; many, environmental damage, noise and pollution, loss of outlook over undeveloped woodland gardens, loss of privacy in back gardens, reduced property values, etc. etc. etc. Clearly unacceptable and not in keeping with retaining the landscape character as per section 5.86. 5. There is no foot path to the south western side of the A287, it would be impossible for pedestrians to cross the busy road at the site of the junction of Upper Old Park Lane and the A287, being almost opposite Drivers Way the entrance to the existing Folly Hill development. 6. The A287 already lacks modern safety in many ways; almost no speed enforcement in affect with little adherence to the 30mph speed limit with through traffic, no traffic calming in place, no speed detecting speed warning signs, little to no police presence to enforce the speed limit, is becoming more difficult for properties to safely merge with the highway, it is not a straight road on a flat level and indeed has bends and rises resulting in no clear line of sight for giving way to traffic clearly demonstrated at the junction of Drivers Way to the A287 almost opposite Upper Old Park Lane. 7. Any development of this nature would have a detrimental effect on the wide use of Upper Old Park Lane for walkers and ramblers, horse riders, cyclists and cross country runners etc.</p>	<p>housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b></p>
10246580124	Liz Ambrose	Stop building houses we don't have room in Farnham!!!!	It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10240207277	M Barnes	Please do not allow the Phyllis Tuckwell Furniture Shop to go as other important sites in Farnham have, i.e. Tennis & Bowling, Swimming Pools. Our local hospice depends on the money raised at this shop! Please save it.	It is not possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to protect specific occupants of buildings. A range of alternative units are provided within Farnham.
10208353532	Marianne Bainbridge	The plan should not have to be reviewed because of greedy housing developers who do not agree with the Farnham community.	It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.
10240427090	Mark Thorne	Site on page 56-57 has been ignored and rejected for no positive reason.	A large number of sites have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLAA this site is not considered to be suitable.
10249723818	Mark Westcott	1.0 Para 1. Sites: Kimbers Lane Site FNPO I feel that serious consideration needs to be given to allocating this site (incl. the Pump Hse.) for future park/square provision. Sites: Sawmill Site I believe this site should be allocated/reserved for future highway provision to connect A325 to A31. I understand the land between the Sawmill site and the bypass (A31) is in the same ownership and there would be support for such a proposal. Such a highway could unlock land for serious nos. of housing/light industry etc, etc. 2.0 I have great concern that the NP makes no attempt to deal with road and pedestrianisation. It fails as a “master plan” for Farnham and, in truth, only deals with housing and not infrastructure. In this it fails as a planning document for the future. Farnham needs a “master plan” and whilst the housing proposals may be OK, this is not the master plan it needs so desperately.	St James Avenue, Farnham Park provides an enclosed play area within 420m walk of the Policy FNPI 4 o) Kimber Lane site. Farnham Park also provides significant other public open space to serve the Kimber Lane site.  Surrey County Council as Highway Authority has no proposal to connect A325 to A31 which cannot therefore be included in the NP Review.  Infrastructure requirements including traffic management measures which create an enhanced pedestrian environment and improved air quality within the Town Centre are set out

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			in Para 5.325 of the NP Review and should be provided through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Pedestrianisation proposals within the highway are not a land use matter and therefore cannot be included within the NP Review. Surrey County Council as Highway Authority has no proposals for a Western by-pass which cannot therefore be included in the NP Review.
10245292500	Mary Stuart-Jones	I commend the thoroughness of the Neighbourhood Plan Review.	Noted
10234788255	Maureen Sharpe	In addition to my previously registered comments as to the unsuitability of the proposed construction of additional houses within the area in question, I fully agree with the points itemised within pages 9, 10 and 37 to 40, map E.	Noted
10198102797	Maximilian Lyons	The updated areas of high landscape value and sensitivity (Map E) Page 37 should be further extended to cover land west of Folly Hill and north of Upper Old Park Lane. The low density residential development in this area, within sizeable plots which accommodate a high level of mature tree cover and landscape features contribute to the retained rural and historic character of Old Park, and its much valued biodiversity. This should not be diminished or materially adversely affected by new housing allocations or developments within the area 'over-sailed' by the Old Park designation as shown on 'Map F' page 39.	The landscape designations in the Neighbourhood Plan are based on the Farnham Landscape Character Assessment, 2018.
10238888817	Michael Hyman	Para 5.107 - Policy NRM6. With the recent decision by Waverley to approve the application for 8 new dwellings within the 400m SPA Protection Zone, based on what is considered to be a perverse change of advice from Natural England which creates a dangerous precedent as far as endangered species are concerned, this paragraph needs revising to make it (even) more robust. The situation with the 1st clause of Policy FNPI2 requires similar treatment to improve its robustness. The requirements of the recent ECJ Ruling C-373/17 with regard to the need for a	The Farnham Neighbourhood Plan policies do not include the requirements for documents to be submitted alongside the many different types of planning application. This is a matter of practice to be established by the

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		Full Appropriate Assessment also need to be embedded in this policy. This will become more important as the availability of SANG dries up and alternative mitigation measures are proposed	Borough Council as the Local Planning Authority charged with determining planning applications. Natural England has not sought any amendment to Policy FNPI2.
10245265444	Michael Pierson	There seems to be a disproportionate number of excluded sites in the Badshot Lea area.	A large number of sites including at Badshot Lea have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLAA some sites are not considered to be suitable.
10248375884	Michael Thurston	SANGS is supported officially but there is no evidence that it works. As a result of WBC's failure to challenge the imposition of 50% of the (questionable) Woking unmet housing target, Farnham has to suffer. Why?	This is a question for Waverley Borough Council who are responsible for the preparation of the Local Plan. It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.
10228847451	Michelle Potter	I currently live on the land which has been assessed as not suitable for housing, see pages 56&57 this is not the case the site is absolutely perfect for accommodating the required houses. Farnham council have said the Site has few landscape features, the Neolithic long barrow has been investigated and partially destroyed by the Victorian railway, it is said it is likely to be acceptable to the market and it has fully approved SANG land. With Planning Permission Work could start 2019!	A large number of sites have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLAA this site is not considered to be suitable.
10196459849	Mike Clark	I support it	Noted
10242732759	Mike Stanley	I only hope that the revised plan is going to be adhered to and not ridden roughshod over by the planners.	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10236064031	Mr & Mrs Ackland	Page 94/95 We understand that the Sewage Treatment Facility is already operating beyond its design capacity and that seemingly there are no plans for improvement. Therefore any increase in dwellings will put further strain on the system as recently occurred on Folly Hill in the Park. Water supply this year has been erratic in the Folly Hill and Hale area with on occasion's extremely low pressure or no water at all. Therefore any increase in demand can only exacerbate this situation. Page 106 Para 5.285 Makes mention of Health Facilities and the consultation process considering impact on these services. Para 5.286 Under Cultural Facilities states. "It is important to plan positively for these facilities and guard against unnecessary loss." Health Facilities locally are already under strain and the above should apply equally.	Infrastructure providers including South East Water in respect of water supply; Thames Water in relation to waste water treatment and the North East Hampshire & Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group in relation to doctors have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Policy FNP31 sets out the approach to Water and Sewerage infrastructure Capacity.
10247693374	Mr & Mrs. Veale	We support this plan as it has managed to provide up to 3000 new homes whilst maintaining the open spaces in the town, maintaining the existing building boundary, the transport, central town redevelopment solution, air pollution within their proposal	Noted
10237470687	Mr Anthony Radnor	No	Noted
10188014323	Mr M Cook	I have no direct comments on the August revision.	Noted
10198020393	Mr R G Precious	Although specific mention is made about the protection of the open countryside and the prevention of coalescence between Rowledge and Wrecchesham, Rowledge and Boundstone and Rowledge and Frensham, consideration should be given to designating these areas as "Areas of High Landscape Value" on Map E (i.e. included in the orange shaded areas on the map on page 37).	The landscape designations in the Neighbourhood Plan are based on the Farnham Landscape Character Assessment, 2018. Only areas assessed as Areas of High Landscape Value and High Landscape Sensitivity



General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			in this recent study are designated in the NP Review.
10224238305	Mrs Jacqui Marler	Covered by my “multiple choice” replies.	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10243842417	Mrs. Ella G R Cattell	<p>Land at Runfold Site Assessment as submitted under the Call for Sites Partial Review FNP Additional Comments on the FNP. The Landowner of this site in Runfold village continues their objective, started at the inception of the FNP in 2012, and that is to present a potential strategic site for the construction of affordable homes supported for viability with mixed housing. This proposal was then, as it is now, accompanied by interested Housing Associations supporting the Landowner's initiative to respond to the identified need for accommodation. In addition the scheme prioritises homes to be tied under 'eligibility' for low cost homes therefore housing local people who live or work in the local authority area. The landowner continues to offer mitigation through the 'suggested' 3D visual sketch plan (please view original Call for Sites submission) which addresses any impact that might be viewed as detrimental to development on the site. It is therefore hoped the site may be re considered as an exception through this representation under the consultation process or have the opportunity of becoming an addendum to the FNP in view of the Landowner's specific development purpose. To amplify further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Runfold could be viewed as an "Inset Village" and the site submitted currently follows an existing settlement line from north of south along the Tongham Road. It is nestled in the heart of this semi village area and is surrounded on three sides by both business and residential properties.</li> <li>• The village density is not just a ribbon of development along the Tongham Road but residential homes and business stretch from The Princess Royal Hotel in the west to Whiteways corner in the east with numerous residential homes and cottages spread on either side of the Guildford Road.</li> <li>• The proposal which accompanied the FNP revised Call for Sites submission serves to demonstrate that a line of Willow trees (northern boundary), retained existing hedgerows (western &amp; southern boundaries together with a proposed woodland walk planting scheme along the eastern boundary would give a natural screen and therefore not visually detract or interrupt the wider area of landscape sensitivity surrounding Runfold village.</li> <li>• The site assessment within the revised FNP states the area is 'remote from services' and describes its location as 'isolated' but the landowner would challenge this statement. A Google Map route from The Jolly Farmer (Kei Restaurant) central in Runfold to Badshot Lea School indicate a 3-minute car journey or 6-minute cycle ride length of travelling time. Walking is 20</li> </ul>	A large number of sites have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLAA this site is not considered to be suitable.

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>minutes as there is an underpass from Old Bridge Road which links with the Tongham Road but current infrastructure delivers a flat tarmac footpath for the entire distance. • In addition, the landowner’s suggested scheme incorporates a drop off point on the site’s southern boundary. With the considerable increase in housing numbers generated in Badshot Lea it would not be unreasonable to suggest that the Waverley Accredited Hoppa or similar Demand Responsive Transport service with wheelchair provision which currently links neighbouring villages could be used to expand links with local villages/towns (Seale &amp; Sands) and access amenities for residents. • Equally there would be an increase in demand for public transport on bus routes for commuters to the existing extensive business, educational, retail and hospitality community currently to be found in Runfold. Long term this might include transport demands to access to the proposed sports pitch initiatives planned nearby and including the Runfold Quarry reclamation as established in the FNP. All together with the existing vibrant business community would further sustain nearby employment opportunities. • In addition, it would not be unreasonable that a Housing Association would consider the provision of premises for a community room or even a retail outlet. The attached proposal eludes to a ‘Garden Community’ with a communal greenhouse located in an existing semi rural village. Therefore its expansion emulates the Government “Garden City and Villages” new proposals under the NPPF 2018. In conclusion: The Planning Advisory Service “Objectively Assessed Need and Housing Targets” paper 2015 suggested that the OAN should: ‘Estimate numbers of households currently in need – meaning those who lack suitable housing and cannot afford such housing in the market sector. Lack of suitable housing is defined by a long list of criteria, or standards, such as homelessness, concealed households, property in major disrepair or unfit for habitation, lack of a bathroom or kitchen, overcrowding, and housing that is too expensive compared to household income.’ The landowner since 2012 and the FNP’s inception has pursued initiatives with Waverley Strategic Housing Department to relate this need to the development objectives for the site. The Farnham Neighbourhood Plan states, there is a “growing need for smaller units in Farnham to meet demand from newly forming household and younger families as well as older downsizing households.” In view of the new guidelines under the revised NPPF 2018 with regard to OAN these now reflect and epitomise the Landowner’s ethos seeking</p>	

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		to deliver constructed homes in the short term for this strata of society within Farnham. Ella G. R. Cattell 27 September 2018.	

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10242963979	Murphy	Farnham is full	Noted. It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.
10190784633	Neil MacDonald	I could not find the parts of the report referred to in the previous two questions in the document	Noted
10233853159	Neil Taylor	Reference Planning WA/2016/1224--102 Dwellings at FPW. All the previous appeal objections are still relevant and for the sake of clarity include :- 1. Environmental issues 2. Transport issues 3. Drainage including foul drainage issues We all know that there is an unacceptable air quality in Farnham Town particularly at the Borough bottle neck and this proposal will cause an increase to the pollution with vehicles backing up Folly Hill even further than they do now. New housing developments should be located to the South and West of the town center which would at least minimise the increase to the traffic pollution.	Noted
10223243791	Neville Carter	Organised, and relevant	Noted
10168648958	Noel Moss	My comment refers to FNP Reference O - the proposed site location at Kimbers Lane. I agree that the site, which already has housing near it, can support more homes and was glad to see that the existence there of the Old Pump House has been recognised. However, I think the importance of preserving this iconic Victorian building, already recently declared as a Heritage Asset, needs to be underlined in the Neighbour Hood plan. The Pump House was a key part of the first drainage infrastructure of the town which came into operation in 1887. It was a site well chosen by the Engineer in Charge as the existence of the present adjacent pumping station demonstrates. The drainage system brought enormous health benefits to the people of Farnham and is therefore a vital part of the social history of the town. The Neighbourhood Plan should categorically state that this building will remain unharmed in any way.	<b>Policy FNP14 o) Kimber Lane</b> The policy states that the site comprises the former Pump House which should be retained within the development. However, the building is not within a Conservation Area or a statutorily listed building and demolition cannot be prevented. Nor is the Pump House a locally listed building to which Neighbourhood Plan Policy FNP9 - Buildings of Local Merit (undesigned heritage assets) could apply. For these reasons, the policy states the preference to retain the building

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			but, if this is not viable, the new development should reflect the character, design and features of the existing building.
10237680326	Pamela Woodward	So pleased to see that the built up area boundary did not have to change significantly as a result of this review of the Neighbourhood Plan. I'm also pleased to see that additional information has been included on the Waverley Abbey Conservation Area.	Noted
10219244323	Paul Somerville	Equally Farnham is a town that has lots of history and historic buildings - the Castle, Keep, Georgian and Tudor buildings - and thus any development must be in consideration of the look and feel of the town...many residents have moved to the town because of the market town charm and this must never be lost.	Noted
10188553000	Peter Bridgeman	No further comments	Noted
10187214404	PETER COLLISON	It appears that this early review is precipitate. My understanding is that this is needed due to Woking failing to meet its required targets. Why on earth are the residents of Farnham expected to make this good? Why not Guildford or any other local authority. Farnham has a limited amount of space that can be used due to protected areas , AONB etc It seems that no account is being taken of this and the people who we have voted into power are not doing enough to protect this special area.	This is a question for Waverley Borough Council who are responsible for the preparation of the Local Plan. It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.
10180310909	Peter Hornsby	No	Noted
10223341884	Peter Jeans	I support Farnham Town Councils plans	Noted
10249534151	Peter Sauter	Where will be the extra doctors, school places, pubs, car parking for the extra 1000-1500 people?	Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council as Education and Highway Authority and the North East Hampshire & Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group in relation to doctors have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32.
10223338971	Peter Smith	I am strongly opposed to further encroachment on the green belt and the rural boundaries of Farnham. In particular the gap between Farnham and Aldershot is disappearing, this should not be allowed to happen.	Noted. Policy FNPI 1 seeks to prevent coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot.
10192321522	Phil Asquith	I particular support the principle of no coalescence between built up areas (Policy FNPI 1). This provides protection for the rural areas that surround and define the villages in this area.	Noted
10204923767	Philip Pateman	The land at Cobgates, whilst appropriate for development, should be appropriately scaled given its proximity to the conservation area. Any planning should ensure that adequate space is left between the rear building line and the footpath to preserve the unique feeling of tranquillity and seclusion. The land is currently home to established trees which should be protected given the influence they have on the local landscape. Any development should be of architectural merit.	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 k) Cobgates</b> site is already an outmoded and vacant building which is no longer required by Surrey County Council. The site should enhance the setting of the Town Centre Conservation Area and retain the trees along Falkner Road. A reduced capacity of approximately 40 dwellings is proposed for this site.</p> <p><b>Add following to the Landscape guidelines:</b></p> <p><b>The established <i>mature trees on the northern boundary and the landscaped boundary to the south</i> should be retained.</b></p> <p><b>Amend the density to approximately 75dph and</b></p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			<b>capacity to approximately 40 dwellings.</b>
10230003287	Rachel Kemp	The field off Green Lane hosts mature Oaks and bats. Please do not ruin their habitat.	<p><b>Policy FNP14 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery</b></p> <p>The site is not currently served by a suitable vehicular access. The site is constrained by a number of trees and has capacity for a limited number of dwellings. Achieving a suitable access to such a small development is likely to prove problematic and the Town Council proposes to delete this potential housing option.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNP14 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery site.</b></p>
10228833714	Rachel Potter	Pages 56 & 57 have been rejected as a housing option for no good reason, * few landscape features * acceptable to the market *could be built in 1-3 years *SANG land approved and provided *Badshot Lea & Weybourne are not joined *A fully sustainable site, with cycle tracks to the station * site invisible from share George's Road and the A31 *our site has a retirement/care home, school, low cost housing , self build doctor or dentist surgery, shared ownership , and is sustainable	A large number of sites have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLAA this site is not considered to be suitable
10243175708	Raveen Matharu	In addition to the above, UCA also request the following factual amendments be made to the FNP Review: • Paragraph 5.163 – The student population varies from year to year, therefore UCA requests that this paragraph is amended as follows: “...with a student population of circa 2,250 (2018)...”. • Paragraphs 5.163, 5.166, 5.183, 5.196, 5.294 and Policy Index (pg. 3) – Please correct all references from the “University of the Creative Arts” to “University for the Creative Arts”. Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the FNP	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Amend 5.163 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>...with a student population of approximately 2,250 (2018).</b></p>



General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		Review. We would be pleased to arrange a meeting to discuss any of our comments with the Town Council in greater detail.	<b>Amend all references to University for the Creative Arts</b>
10196087567	Richard HOLWAY	We need new housing - particularly 'affordable' housing. This should be undertaken in the designated areas and NOT on the greenbelt or other more rural areas of Farnham. These areas are for the enjoyment of ALL - not just those who live there already. So it is really not 'Nimbyism'. Just preserving the 'Best of Farnham' for generations to come.	Noted
10233960986	Richard Steijger	I fully support the plan and it makes complete sense to me	Noted
10223914827	Roy Sharpe	I support 100% the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan Review.	Noted
10199936672	Rupert lane	Strong support for FNPI I - the creation of a 'Green Belt' between Aldershot & Farnham so that they do not just become one contiguous settlement.	Noted
10182440339	S Ford	I didn't think Farnham was the only town in Waverley	This is a question for Waverley Borough Council who are responsible for the preparation of the Local Plan. It is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.
10226010253	S.Porter	Regardless of how many houses we have to accommodate in this area, the road systems do NOT seem to be taken into account. As it is at present we have queues going into Farnham Town, queues along Farnham bypass, queues going along Farnborough Road by Hale Church, queues going through Wrecclesham. We live in Weybourne and our son lives in Wrecclesham, it can take us 35-40 mins to get to him. The highways MUST look at this. They can not say it is acceptable because its NOT. There is a high proportion of older people in Farnham that need transport to get from A to B who cannot walk distances. What is going to happen to them, The infrastructure needs serious attention.	Infrastructure providers including Surrey County Council as Highways Authority have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Surrey County Council as Highway Authority has no proposals for a Western by-pass which cannot therefore be included in the NP.
10190871265	Sam Everitt	Prioritise the traffic and pollution problems. It's probably beyond your control but force developers to fund traffic improvements beyond just getting cars out of new developments and in to the traffic jams.	Infrastructure providers, including Surrey County Council as Highway Authority, have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Transport impacts will be judged by Policy FNP30.
10226425756	Sam Osmond	Strong support!	Noted
10246135936	Sarah	A more flexible approach should be taken to planning, to allow change of use away from residential where it would be beneficial to the community as a whole. The need for housing should not be the only factor in any neighbourhood plan.	Noted
10230978388	Sawyer	The Neighbourhood Plan as it stands seems OK to my husband and I	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10247344393	Sharon Pierson	Regarding the land adjacent to the cemetery on Green Lane. One of the factors that helped us decide to move into Greenhill Way was the decision of the Council to not build on that land - and we were told it may be used as a woodland burial site but nothing more. Building on this land will mean all the houses at the end of Greenhill Way will be severely overlooked, children will lose access to a much used field for playing and picnics. Dog walkers will also lose the ability to walk their dogs - and there is hardly any other open land in the area for the activity within walking distance in the area. The impact on the loss of this space will affect a large amount of the local community and have an impact on the general well being of all in the area affected. There are a lot of bats nesting in the trees and other wildlife such as badgers which also live on that land. Whilst accepting that additional houses are needed - trying to shoe horn 10 houses onto this site is not acceptable and I ask the Council to reconsider the plans for this site and keep to their original decision and leave the land as it is.	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery</b></p> <p>The site is not currently served by a suitable vehicular access. The site is constrained by a number of trees and has capacity for a limited number of dwellings. Achieving a suitable access to such a small development is likely to prove problematic and the Town Council proposes to delete this potential housing option.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery site.</b></p>
10224057485	Sieglinde Ward	No	Noted
10209804489	Simon HAYES	The maps are impossible to read (even after downloading and viewing in Adobe Acrobat) Maps of extreme relevance to the discussion and this survey on page 46 & 37 should be available as a high resolution separate downloads as should all future maps that require study for a comprehensive understanding of your recommendations. Without which, ploughing through a massive overview which is in itself daunting and enough to put a majority of residence off becomes a pointless exercise. Maybe that's by design?	<p>Noted. Farnham Town Council arranged an extensive consultation process for the Regulation 14 stage.</p> <p><b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b></p>
10185785321	Simon Packer	Please see attached letter and appendix	<p><b>Delete 918 Land West of Folly Hill, Farnham from FHLAA as, against the wishes of the Town Council, consent was granted at appeal for 96 dwellings on this site (Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/17/3171409)</b></p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10226058609	Sorrel Price	There are other more suitable areas. Do NOT build on greenbelt land. We'll lose lots of natural habitats- once gone- gone forever!	<p><b>Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b> The site is constrained by a number of trees; has capacity for a limited number of dwellings and is in multiple ownership which may constrain its comprehensive development as a housing allocation. The site is accessed by an unadopted Upper Old Park Lane which is narrow and has no footpath and improvements to adoptable highway standards may adversely affect the mature oak trees which line the route. For these reasons, the site is not proposed to be carried forward as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site remains within the Built Up Area Boundary and any development proposals would have to be assessed against Policy FNPI of the NP Review and the adopted Farnham Design Statement 2010.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI 4 n) 8, 10, 12, 14 Upper Old Park Lane</b></p> <p><b>Policy FNPI 4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery</b></p> <p>The site is not currently served by a suitable vehicular access. The site is constrained by a number of trees</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			<p>and has capacity for a limited number of dwellings. Achieving a suitable access to such a small development is likely to prove problematic and the Town Council proposes to delete this potential housing option.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery site.</b></p>
10247700555	Steve Bailey	<p>I am particularly concerned the land adjacent to Green Lane cemetery for a number of reasons- This land is used by dog walkers, children and families for recreational purposes. Where will be able to bury our dead when the cemetery fills up? Surely removing gardens from council properties to gain access to the site is not a compromise the council should be taking. Where will all the cars go that currently park at the end of Thurbans Road? This is a precious green space within our built up area. It is home to bats, foxes, hedgehogs and many others.</p>	<p><b>Policy FNPI4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery</b></p> <p>The site is not currently served by a suitable vehicular access. The site is constrained by a number of trees and has capacity for a limited number of dwellings. Achieving a suitable access to such a small development is likely to prove problematic and the Town Council proposes to delete this potential housing option.</p> <p><b>Delete Policy FNPI4 p) Land adjacent to Green Lane Cemetery site.</b></p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10245533110	Stewart Edge	<p>Question 2 above (Landscape designation....MAP E Page 37) I believe that the land just North of the Hopfields development in North West Farnham should be protected as an area of High value / high sensitivity (Area 4 in Farnham Landscape Character Report). Since the original Neighbourhood Plan, as well as the Farnham Landscape Character Report there has also been the Waverley Local Plan which has confirmed the local ASVI (Area of Strategic Visual Importance) designation for the southern part of Area 4, and (until a final Surrey review) the AGLV status for the northern part of Area 4. How can an area be in an Area of Strategic Visual Importance and yet not be defined as a highly sensitive landscape area? I believe the Farnham Landscape Report has simply got it wrong.</p> <p>Question 3 above (SANGS) If SANGS is to be effective as a mitigation of new development then it must be accessible to a significant number of the residents of existing and new development areas. Before the proposed areas South of the A31 can be effective SANGS areas there must be pedestrian access for people from Badshot Lea to the North of the A31 by for example an underpass.</p>	<p>The ASVI is a Local Plan designation which is being reviewed by Waverley Borough Council and has a different justification to Areas of High Landscape Value and High Landscape Sensitivity. The landscape designations in the Neighbourhood Plan are based on the Farnham Landscape Character Assessment, 2018. Only areas assessed as Areas of High Landscape Value and High Landscape Sensitivity in this recent study are designated in the NP Review.</p> <p>Natural England have stated that taking into account the capacity which will become available at the Tongham Road SANG (570 dwellings in total, after both phases are complete), there will be adequate SANG capacity available to deliver the proposed quantum of housing. In order to achieve SANG of a sufficient scale to attract dog walkers, it is expected that strategic provision will be required. In some cases it is accepted by Natural England that access to these strategic sites will be by car.</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10192072660	Susan Everitt	<p>Page 53 and 54 The amount of housing allocated to two sites off Lower Weybourne Lane is way out of proportion to the area and penalises this side of the town. Local schools are over subscribed, traffic is heavy at peak times and this would be a loss of important green space in the area. Wildlife would suffer and ancient hedgerows would be endangered by development. Housing allocation needs to be balanced between all areas of Farnham. How does this compare to new housing sites within the South Farnham area?</p>	<p>The proposal to allocate Part of SSE Farnham depot and Land west of Green Lane for housing development has not changed since the made Neighbourhood Plan. Infrastructure providers, including Surrey County Council as Education and Highway Authority, have responded in detail to the additional housing proposed in Farnham and have raised no objection to the NP Review. Infrastructure capacity as set out in Para 5.325 of the NP Review will be increased through contributions from development through the provisions of Policy FNP32. Transport impacts will be judged by Policy FNP30. Only the latter of these allocations is on a greenfield site and is not public open space. In addition the policy requires the footpath along the southern edge of the site should be retained to provide access to the children's play space to the west and a contribution made towards the Blackwater Valley cycle scheme between Aldershot and Farnham Town Centres and Rail Stations. Furthermore, measures should be provided to promote the use of that part of Green Lane not required for vehicular access for walking and cycling only. The policy</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
			also seeks traffic calming measures to minimise vehicle speeds within the site should also be introduced to help make streets safer.
10172163329	Susan Farrow	P.37, Map E: areas of high landscape value and sensitivity. I believe there is a glaring omission here, the Coxbridge Farm land NW of Farnham. This open agricultural land has little statutory protection, but it is the main part of the Coxbridge Farm land. The farm dates back to the late 15th century. The farmhouse, which is partly Tudor and partly 18th century is a Grade II Listed Building. The 18th century barns are Grade II Listed in their own right. I can provide historical information about the farm, and the important Farnham families (the Vernons and the Knights) who have lived there in the past. I am aware that part of the farm land, to the north and east of the farmhouse, is designated for some 350 new houses but that hugely increases the need to protect the remaining land stretching northwards to Crondall Lane. The owners of the farm want to preserve the integrity of the farm, with a view to creating a history farm and encourage wildlife on the remaining land, and providing access to the public on a pre-arranged basis. I believe that this land should be declared a designated Historic Asset (a classification which the NPPF states can include landscape).	The landscape designations in the Neighbourhood Plan are based on the Farnham Landscape Character Assessment, 2018. Only areas assessed as Areas of High Landscape Value and High Landscape Sensitivity in this recent study are designated in the NP Review. The farm complex of listed buildings to the southern corner of the site are, by definition, already heritage assets and Policy FNPI4i already states that the design and layout of development should preserve the special architectural and historic interest of these buildings and their setting. Heritage assets can include a site or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest but are not designated through the neighbourhood planning process.
10205766154	Thomas Lankester	This survey has been flawed with respect to Map E on page 37 of the revised Neighbourhood Plan. Firstly the legend on the plan is almost illegible, secondly the question options are all or nothing. There is no option to support some designations but disagree with others. I strongly agree with the Old Park designation as this land, at the top of a hill is highly prominent and part of the	A large number of sites have been assessed for housing development in preparing the NP Review and for the reasons set out in the FHLAA this site is not considered to be suitable



General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		historic Farnham Park area. Conversely, the area adjacent to the SE edge of Farnham Park (near St John's Church, Hale) is not accessible or highly visible. Developer plans would both release land for potential expansion of Farnham Park whilst screening the development and removing a power pylon from view.	<b>Maps to be improved in Regulation 15 Neighbourhood Plan</b>
10226362809	Tony Strudiwck	No comment	Noted
10233946129	Upper Old Park Lane Residents Association	We support the document, and feel that it is well drafted. It is, however, most important that the basic principles and policies be upheld, for example those outlined on pages 34 and 36.	Noted
10177521740	Valerie Nye	I would like to thank Farnham Town Council for all the work that has gone into the process of producing the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan. This has been a monumental task and residents have been kept well informed with their views being sought.	Noted
10247347778	Webb	with regard to the other survey questions, I spent about four days worth of time reading all the documents necessary to vote on the previous version of the neighbourhood plan and at this moment in time do not have this amount of time available. I do strongly agree, however, on any amount of land being added as a protected area of landscape value as we live in a beautiful area which should be protected for future generations to enjoy and in time protect themselves. I strongly disagree with the eradication of any 'old' houses with large gardens being seen as 'building opportunities', large gardens still being enjoyed by many and extremely important for wildlife and biodiversity. Without the multitude of these beautiful old homes, Farnham could become 'just another town with lots of housing' visible on a drive through.	Noted
10228726088	Wendy Montague	Cllr Cockburn has worked tirelessly with residents, guiding us through planning requirements and keeping pace with changing goal posts. Very disappointed with Waverley's acceptance of taking on Woking's housing allocation, which is not to the benefit of Farnham or Cranleigh. The plan is a good working plan for Farnham given the circumstances.	Noted
10240049115	William Norris	See comments above.	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
10232806025	Yolande	Where does it discuss single one off houses?	The NP Review only allocates sites which are 0.2ha or larger. Smaller scale developments continue to come forward within the Plan area as indicated by the windfall allowance and are assessed against Policy FNPI - Design of New development and Conservation together with other relevant policies.
10240197944	Z.Wyse	Section 3 - Farnham Future - The Vision 3.02 Farnham East? 3.03 Heavy Goods Vehicles removal? Section 5 Support for local listing of buildings of merit 5.216 Retail Development?	Noted
10224153787	Zofia Lovell	Strongly support the suggested sites and look forward to the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan moving forward without the necessity of any Referendum.	Noted
10240383114	Zofia Lovell, Chairman, South Farnham R.A	The NPPF (Para 14) supports Neighbourhood Plans (para 28,29,30)	Noted
	Colin Hall CPRE Surrey	<p>The CPRE Surrey Waverley District Committee welcomes the focus in the revisions to the Plan on brownfield sites and sites within the Built up Area Boundary in order to meet its additional housing allocations in the Local Plan part I.</p> <p>CPRE strongly approves the support given in the Revised Plan to the Green Belt and AONB and supports the proposals for the extension of the AONB (now before Natural England).</p> <p>CPRE believes that urban or town sprawl is a considerable threat to Farnham and supports the maintenance of the Farnham Built-up Area Boundary, which, together with the policies in the Plan, should help reduce the threat.</p> <p>CPRE welcomes the policy to protect the attractive countryside outside the built up area from inappropriate development.</p>	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>CPRE supports the policies for the maintenance of the Farnham /Aldershot Strategic Gap and for preventing coalescence between Wrecclesham and Rowledge, Rowledge and Frensham and Badshot Lea and Weybourne.</p> <p>CPRE supports the policy to protect and enhance biodiversity and the SPAs.</p> <p>CPRE welcomes the importance given in the Plan to good design and the need to take into account the distinctive character and heritage of each area.</p> <p>The additional housing allocation to Farnham is as a result of the Inspector requiring Waverley to meet 50% of Woking’s unmet need. This requirement is being challenged at a judicial review by CPRE Surrey and the POW group. If successful, Waverley Councillors will be able to revisit policy ALH 1 and the additional allocation to Farnham.</p>	
	<p>Chris Baines Sustainable Development Thames Team Natural England</p>	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA)</p> <p>We have reviewed the ‘European Special Protection Areas and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace’ supporting document (August 2018). This document states that as of October 2017, Farnham Park SANG has capacity remaining for 1069 dwellings. It is our understanding that within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA planning zone, a total of 1366 dwellings, including the additional 450 allocated through Waverley’s Local Plan Part 1, have been allocated which have not yet been granted permission, and which must secure SANG capacity in order to be delivered.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018) was laid before Parliament on 7 December and will come into force on 28 December 2018.</p> <p>The legislation includes an amendment to the basic conditions tests in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This allows neighbourhood plans that could have a likely significant effect on a protected habitat to be made, following an Appropriate Assessment, to demonstrate that development would not have a</p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>The Plan should demonstrate adequate SANG capacity to deliver the stated quantity of new housing. Taking into account the capacity which will become available at the Tongham Road SANG (570 dwellings in total, after both phases are complete), there will be adequate SANG capacity available to deliver the proposed quantum of housing, assuming that the capacity at Farnham Park is allocated to areas which the Tongham Road SANG will not be able to cater for due to its smaller catchment area. We would note that SANG capacity should be secured in advance of outline planning permission, and housing on the Eastern side of the Parish will also not be able to secure capacity from Tongham Road SANG until SANG works are complete. Any housing relying on the proposed Runfold South Quarry SANG to secure capacity, which has not yet been granted permission, cannot be delivered until such a time as this or another SANG option is secured.</p> <p>European Court of Justice Case C-323/17 People Over Wind v Coillte Teoranta The outcome of this European Court Judgement establishes that where mitigation measures are proposed in relation to European sites, these should be considered at the Appropriate Assessment stage when determining the effect on the site. An interpretation of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations may conclude that Neighbourhood Plans requiring Appropriate Assessment cannot proceed. We understand that Waverley Borough Council have sought legal advice in relation to this, and would advise you to consult them on this matter.</p> <p>Annex A provides information on the natural environment and issues and opportunities for your Neighbourhood planning.</p>	harmful impact on the integrity of the habitat site.
	North East Hampshire & Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>We would hope to see a total of circa £250,000 to £300,000 contribution made to health care infrastructure through developers' Planning Obligations based on the additional 450 housing units.</p> <p>The ascertainment is broadly made as follows, using the aggregation of additional homes across all sites.</p> <p>450 extra houses times by an average of 2.4 persons per household (a nationally recognized planning metric) = 1080 potential additional residents = additional</p>	<p><b>Add new Para to Infrastructure Section:</b></p> <p><b>NHS North East Hampshire And Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group anticipate meeting the need for further capacity for locally provided Primary Care (GPs)</b></p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		<p>patients. We initially assume this is a raw patient list-size addition, rather than weighted - e.g. for MID. The principal development contribution sought is toward meeting the consequential increase in demand and capacity for locally provided Primary Care (i.e GPs) and Community Care and this is translated (long-hand) or by a guide into space needs and costs, by taking an average number of patient consultations per person per year (5.6 for Primary care - another nationally recognized planning metric) and then translating this into the number of GPs and/or nurses required (WTE); and then using a range of appointment durations (i.e. from face to face to telephone and GP to Nurse-led), calculating the numbers and types of clinical rooms needed to support this type and level of activity.</p> <p>For 1080 patients, this will equate to approximately half a WTE GP or Nurse and one extra clinical room equivalent (as far as overall demand is concerned) - However overall space / infrastructure considerations will also need to be given to additional support areas (non-clinical / ancillary) on a pro-rata basis, typically equivalent to not less than approx. 4 times the clinical room space, e.g. for things like : entrance, reception, waiting, circulation, amenity areas, offices / admin, storage etc. and externally for access and parking. So, if a typical clinical room is 18sq.m the overall spatial allowance would be not less than between 75 sq.m. and upto 100 sq.m. This would then be costed at a new-build rate (i.e. to extend or construct) using a cost per sq.m (say, of approx. £3,000 all in to include design and fees etc.). This would give an estimated contribution for Primary care of between £225,000 (using 75 sq.m planning allowance) and £300,000 using the 100. A further allowance is made for Community Care Services (non-acute) in locality settings for contributions to Community Health infrastructure, but using a lower contact rate of 1.25 health contacts per head of population per year. (In this instant, this doesn't make a material difference to the theoretical minimum number of rooms required, but would probably require another / different room type).</p> <p>The Rules of Thumb hence reasonably generate a contribution sum estimate of between not less than £500 per home / unit and upto £750 per home / unit</p>	<p><b>and Community Care through developer contributions.</b></p> <p><b>Infrastructure Contributions</b></p> <p><b>Add to infrastructure requirements needed to support new development:</b></p> <p><b>...capacity for locally provided Primary Care (GPs) and Community Care</b></p>

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		(where the rate would arguably be better assessed according to the housing mix and sizes / numbers of bedrooms). A very approximate one-size fits all allowance would be based on £600 per housing unit. The CCG would administer the allocation of planning obligations to specific projects in agreement with the Local Authority and Developer.	
	Historic England	I can confirm that Historic England has no comment to make on the proposed revisions to the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
	Surrey County Council - Education	<p>Since responding to the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan consultation with the email below, I have received supplementary comments from our schools commissioning team setting out in detail why we do not have any significant concerns with regard to the 450 additional homes between now and 2032.</p> <p>These comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 450 homes would likely generate around 16 pupils per primary and secondary year groups. However, the homes will not be all constructed and occupied at the same time and the development would be spread over a number of years - as such we do not have any particular concerns on the impact on local schools.</li> <li>• Some expansion of primary schools has taken place in recent years to provide sufficient capacity going forward. In term of secondary provision, Weydon has expanded, and expansion of Farnham Heath End is underway.</li> <li>• Birth rates in the Farnham area are showing a decreasing trend following a peak in 2015, growth from additional development would balance this out.</li> <li>• However projections for school places do change and therefore we will monitor the ongoing demand as the plans progress and as new development comes forward and also with demographic changes. Appropriate action will be undertaken as required to ensure a sufficiency of places.</li> </ul>	Noted
	South East Water Developer Mains Inbox Service Management	I have read through the information provided and can advise that South East Water would still stand by the information present in 2.46 "South East Water have indicated that proposed development would need a small amount of local reinforcement to supply the additional demand at specific sites".	Noted

General comments			
Respondent ID	Respondent	Representation	FTC Response
		I can confirm South East have the infrastructure with in the Farnham area to accommodate the extra 450 properties required.	